

**GARVEY,
LUMUMBA
AND MALCOLM: BLACK
NATIONAL-SEPARATISTS**

by
Shawna Maglangbayan

wTp

THIRD WORLD PRESS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

First Edition
 Second Printing, August 1973
 Third Printing, April 1976
 Fourth Printing, March 1979

Copyright © 1972 by Shawna Maglangbayan

All Rights Reserved

No material in this book can be copied, reproduced, or used
 in any way without written permission from
 Third World Press 7524 S. Cottage Grove, Chicago, Illinois 60619

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 7

Part One

MARCUS GARVEY

1. Garvey and the UNIA 19
2. Myths and Fallacies
 about Garvey 32
3. The Meaning of Garveyism 36

Part Two

PATRICE LUMUMBA

1. Lumumba and the
 "Independence" of the Congo 43
2. The Aryan Offensive
 Against Lumumba 48
3. The Essence of Lumumbism 65

Part Three

MALCOLM X

1. Malcolm X and Islam 69



2. Malcolm X and Africa	77
3. Malcolm X and "Third-Worldism"	83
4. Malcolm X and the Black American Struggle	93
5. Malcolm X in Perspective	104
CONCLUSION	109

INTRODUCTION

AS SURELY AS MARCUS GARVEY, PATRICE Lumumba and Malcolm X were lynched yesterday, they are being lynched today for a second time.

Yesterday the white man destroyed Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm bodily. Today he is trying to destroy them ideologically by deforming and commercializing their political thought. While alive, any and all means were used to slander their names, hinder their movements, isolate them from their people, sabotage their work, ridicule their accomplishments and ultimately execute them. Once dead, they are delivered into the hands of a second lynching party: the adroit, cunning, Aryan¹ supremacist gang which poses as the "best friend" of Black mankind.

The most prominent members of the lynching mob who have set upon Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm are cloaked in the sheets of marxism. Advancing upon our heroes with cries of "International Fraternity!" soon none but their voice is heard. And when we ask: "What did *our* heroes say?," we are told that they said, "Long Live International Fratern-

1. *ARYAN*: Throughout this essay, the term *Aryan* shall be used interchangeably with *white* to designate all members of this race. We shall depart from the usual usage of the term "Caucasian"—a highly incorrect and unscientific term—in designating members of the Aryan (or white) race. As far as we are concerned, an Aryan is either a *Semite* (Jew or Arab), a *Latin* (from Europe or South America), a *Nordic* (from Germany or the U.S.A.), or a *Slav* (whether in Russia or in Canada).

ity!" From then on, it is no longer the voice of Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm which falls on our ears, but that of the marxist rabble whose company these three men are said to have joined or to have "considered" joining.

The facts speak for themselves. There is hardly a single book written about Patrice Lumumba that isn't the work of one or another Aryan of the "friendly" type. His speeches have been compiled as well—with inevitable "explanatory" prefaces—by "friendly" Aryans. His only book, *Congo My Country*, written in 1956 during the earlier period of his political development, and which appeared only after his death, was prefaced by another "friendly" Aryan.

The greater part of what has been written about Malcolm X has come from the enemy's pen. The works of Malcolm have been literally taken over by the "friendly" Aryan group. It is they who compile his speeches, splice his words, "correct" his thinking and put it out on the market preceded by lengthy "explanatory" prefaces and introductions. One American Trotskyist has been so busy "explaining," "correcting" and prefacing Malcolm X's political thinking, that he is currently referred to as the "expert" on the matter. Another Trotskyist "expert" on Malcolm X, who has cropped up in Europe, poisoned the French edition of *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* with his "explanatory" preface.

Concerning Garvey, it wasn't until recently (1967) that his *Philosophy and Opinions* became available again after being consigned to oblivion for almost forty years. With the exception of *Garvey and Garveyism*, written and published by his widow, Amy Jacques Garvey—and practically impossible to find anywhere—Blacks have had to rely on the deformed account provided by another "friendly" Aryan in a

book entitled *Black Moses*. Everything has been done to keep the real Garvey out of the reach of his people.²

Whether they go under the pseudonyms of trotskyism, castroism or marxism-leninism, marxists have consistently sought to sap the life-blood from Black political thinking and sidetrack the struggle of Black mankind by undermining and sabotaging every Black national-separatist effort. How do they go about this? Simply by posing as revolutionaries who are equipped with the one and only philosophy that can "save" Black mankind. He who doesn't adhere to this philosophy isn't revolutionary, but "counter-revolutionary." That's the type of whitemail that the marxists put down; that's their chief form of ideological terrorism against those who refuse to fall into their bankrupt ranks.³

2. A great deal of credit must be given to the widow of Marcus Garvey, Amy Jacques Garvey. It is she who is responsible for the compiling of *Philosophy and Opinions* and for its subsequent publication. In her own book, *Garvey and Garveyism*, she recounts how Aryan publishers had flatly refused to publish the two volumes of *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*. It was with tremendous difficulty that she finally managed to get the first edition of *Philosophy and Opinions* published in 1927. As she further details, its circulation was mainly dependent on a word-of-mouth and hand-to-hand diffusion. If it hadn't been for her constant efforts to keep the real Marcus Garvey alive and his printed word intact, there is no telling what would have become of Garvey's political thought.

3. The Black American scholar, Harold Cruse, has produced what is, to date, the most thorough and lucid analysis of the nefarious role of left-wing trends vis-à-vis the struggle of Blacks in the United States (and by extension, everywhere else). His, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* (William Morrow & Co., New York, 1967), a real masterpiece of independent Black scholarship, is an indispensable work in the study of the crippling influence that the marxist dogma has exercised over Blacks in general. On the other hand, it is an important key to the understanding of the development (or lack of it) of political

By attempting to appropriate the legacy of Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm, and by deforming their thinking so that it appears to be pro-marxist, if not actually marxist, Aryan Leftists are showing how white supremacist they are. What they're actually saying is that a Black man couldn't stand up for the freedom and independence of his Black brethren *unless* he is marxist-inclined.

When left-wing white supremacy proclaims that Garvey, Malcolm X, or Lumumba were, at one point or another, "turning" to marxism, what they're actually telling us is that the political relevancy of these Black men can only be attributed to their being "under the influence" of one or another Aryan dogma.

The chief and only aim of this brief analysis of the political significance of the three single Black men whose actions have decidedly marked the universal history of Black men and women in the 20th century—Marcus Garvey, Patrice Lumumba and Malcolm X—is that of presenting them in the only light which seems to us to be the correct one. Our goal is that Black men and women the world over may have a better grasp of what these men stood for, why they did what they did and in which direction they were headed. To understand these issues, we feel, will better enable each one of us to assume our historical responsibilities and instill us with that sense of mission which animated these three Black men.

thought among Blacks in the United States. Many of the conclusions expressed in this essay bear the direct influence of this important contribution of Harold Cruse.

II

When we consider that at present the Black race surpasses one billion in number and is spread out from one end of the globe to the other, then, we can begin to understand something about the greatness of Marcus Garvey, Patrice Lumumba and Malcolm X. No three men have spanned as many oceans and continents, cut across as many frontiers, defied as many differences of language and culture, and evoked such a unanimous response from Black mankind, as they. What is it in their names which have won the sympathy of Black men and women the world over? What is it about their lives which generated a force that knew no boundary in the Black world? Who were these men who made such an impact on Black humanity?

Each of these three men originated in different regions of the Black world: Garvey in the Caribbean, Lumumba in Africa, and Malcolm X in North America. Yet what they taught was not limited to any one specific area of the Black universe. When they spoke, it was in the name of Blacks everywhere, whether in Brazil, India, Venezuela, Ceylon or Melanesia; whether in Australia, Canada, New Guinea or Malaysia. Their message was as relevant to Blacks in the Caribbean, Central and South America, as it was to those in Europe; as meaningful to Blacks in North America as it was to those in Africa, Asia and Oceania. They voiced the revindications, not of a geographical region, but of an oppressed and exploited *race!*

Marcus Garvey bridled two centuries, living from 1887 until 1940. Both Patrice Lumumba and Malcolm X were born in 1925. Both were assassinated in the 60's (Lumumba in 1961, Malcolm X in 1965). Each began his active

political life in his twenties. Garvey's political life-span lasted for thirty years; for Malcolm X it was slightly more than ten years, and for Lumumba it was less than ten years. But this in itself tells us very little about who these men were or what they stood for. To understand who Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm X were, we must first establish the general historico-political context into which these three men evolved.

Ever since aggressive Aryan intrusions destroyed the last vestige of independent Black nationhood and put a check on the *autonomous* political and socio-economic evolution of the Black world, there have been only two lines of thought and action conditioning the political, economic and cultural movement of Black societies. The one line is determined by a movement towards *fusion* with the dominant Aryan framework through "cooperation," "alliance," "partnership," etc. The other line is determined by a movement in the *opposite* direction. The first we term the *integrationist* line. To the second line we have given the name, *national-separatist*.

The roots of Black national-separatism itself go back many centuries. Its seeds were sown in those first national wars of resistance against Aryan expansionism and aggression, when Blacks fought, struggled, bled and died in defense of Black lands and Black lives. Unlike the embryonic integrationist who, for a heap of worthless trinkets and cloth, aided and abetted white penetration into the Black world, national-separatists took up arms and resisted the white onslaught. They rejected the treaties and pacts of "association" and "alliance" set before them by the Aryan aggressors.

Following in the footsteps of their national-separatist predecessors, came other generations of equally determined Black men and women who, with or without arms, fought to break the shackles of colonial and chattel enslavement,

forced labor, colonial subjugation and exploitation. They didn't seek the favors of the slave master and colonial overseer as did the integrationist collaborators. They sought ways and means to destroy the system of Black bondage. It was national-separatists, Black men and women imbued with a racial and national consciousness, who led those fierce anti-colonial and anti-slavery insurrections that raged throughout the whole of the Americas, Africa and Black-inhabited Asia and Oceania. The only lineage in the Black world that can claim a centuries-long past of struggle *against* the stranglehold of Aryan subjugation and exploitation is the national-separatist line.

This is the general historico-political background into which Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm X evolved. That same lineage which gave us Dessalines (Haiti) and N'Zinga (Angola), gave us Marcus Garvey in 1887 on the island of Jamaica. That same lineage which gave rise to Dingane (South Africa) and Ganga Zumba (Brazil), equally gave rise to Patrice Lumumba in 1925 in the Congo. That same lineage which gave us Nat Turner (U.S.A.), José Aponte (Cuba) and Dedan Kimathi (Kenya), likewise gave us Malcolm X in 1925 in the United States of America.

III

It would not only be a dangerous oversimplification but, in fact, an error to state that either Lumumba, Malcolm or Garvey were "born" national-separatists. Their upbringing was predominately integrationist just as ours is. No Black person today is exempt from one form or another of integrationism. We are all tainted in varying degrees with the

integrationist, assimilationist outlook. The day is yet to come when an entire generation of Blacks will be armed from the cradle, both psychologically, spiritually and otherwise, with a national-separatist outlook on life. Neither Garvey, Lumumba nor Malcolm were part of that still-to-emerge generation.

The upbringing of these three Black men was, therefore, not much different from that of the rest of us. What needs to be underlined is that once Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm X were awakened to a Black racial consciousness, they never let up in their struggle to weed out their integrationist roots. These were men who did everything in their power to effect the necessary transformations that would make them dignified, proud Black men, not carbon copies of the Aryan. Nothing ever deterred them from pursuing this objective. From the moment they were stirred to racial awareness to the time they died, they were living examples of the type of determination, will, and force of character it takes to be a national-separatist.

These three Black men were figures of an international scope, on a world scene dominated and controlled by white supremacists. We have a tendency to forget the sort of intrigues and plots, the treacherous and constant harassment faced by these men, twenty-four hours a day, every day. What didn't the Aryan do to try and subvert them and buy them off in one way or another? No temptation of any kind was strong enough to overthrow these three Black men. Their lives testify to this.

In spite of the overwhelming obstacles put in their way day in and day out, Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm X remained faithful to their mission. Like their national-separatist predecessors, they came to see the salvation of the Black race as dependent upon the *independent* assertion of Black

humanity along its own economic, political, cultural, military and ideological lines of development.

Marcus Garvey, Patrice Lumumba and Malcolm X are the three most outstanding exponents of national-separatism in the twentieth century.

Part One

MARCUS GARVEY

CHAPTER 1

GARVEY AND THE UNIA

TODAY BLACK PEOPLE ARE BECOMING increasingly aware of Marcus Garvey, although it is not certain that this awareness embraces the totality or even the most relevant aspects of Garvey's imprint upon the Black world. Who was Garvey? The picture that immediately comes into most minds can be resumed in a single phrase: "Back-to-Africa." This already shows to what extent we have become victims of the crude, simplistic propaganda under which the true image of Garvey is buried. To assume that the political thinking of Marcus Garvey, his aim in life, and the reasons for his organizing the most powerful contemporary political movement in the Black world, can be reduced to the "objective" of shipping more than a hundred million Blacks to Africa, is the greatest insult we could render to a Black man of Garvey's political stature.

It is currently said that Garvey aimed at "transplanting" the Blacks of the Americas to the African continent. It is also suggested that it was to this end that he attempted to procure land in Liberia and established two steamship lines (i.e., *The Black Star Line* and *The Black Cross Navigation and Trading Company*). Recently, one Aryan scholar, true to his kind, has even insidiously suggested that Garvey's aim

might have been the "colonization" of the Blacks of Africa by the Blacks of the Americas.

The place that Garvey assigned to Africa in his program and the role he assigned to the Blacks of the Americas can best be gotten from his own words: "We are not preaching any doctrines to ask all the Negroes . . . to leave for Africa. The majority of us may remain here, but *we must send our scientists, our mechanics, and our artizans, and let them build railroads, let them build the great educational and other institutions necessary.* . . ."¹ Concerning the shipping vessels, Garvey added: "Africa must be linked to the United States, to South and Central America, to the West Indies by vessels *which will unite in fraternal ties* the ebony-hued sons of Ethiopia in the Western Hemisphere with their brothers across the sea."²

Not once did Garvey urge or envision the migration of all the Blacks in the Western Hemisphere to Africa. There was no "Back-to-Africa" mystique about Garvey's program. Garvey dealt with realities. He wanted the white man *out* of Africa. He wanted a free, independent, United Africa that would become the *bastion* of the Black world. He wanted the entire African continent to be under the rightful control and power of its own people. He desired its riches, its wealth and resources to exclusively benefit the whole of Black mankind, beginning with Blacks on the African soil.

When Garvey called upon Black technicians, Black scientists, Black educators and other Black experts to pool their knowledge and efforts in the direction of African emancipation, it was because he envisioned Africa as a

1. Marcus Garvey, as quoted by E. U. Essien-Udom, *Black Nationalism*, Laurel Edition, Dell Publishing Co., New York, 1964, p. 385. (Our italics.)

2. Ibid. (Our italics.)

future center of industrial, technological and scientific development in the Black world, a bastion of economic, military, political, social and cultural power for the Black race. When Garvey went about organizing the U.N.I.A. (Universal Negro Improvement Association)—the only popular, universal, Black national-separatist movement organized to date in the history of the Black race—it was with this objective in mind. All of this was summed up in his slogan: "Africa for the Africans, those at home and those abroad." And it is not by accident that Malcolm X and Lumumba, too, would later envision things in this light.

The establishment of the U.N.I.A. was to itself one of the greatest single accomplishments of Marcus Garvey. Even today, few of us think of organizing a movement outside of our own districts, tribes, provinces or states. Some of us can't even conceive of organization beyond our own neighborhood. The establishment of the U.N.I.A., during a period when radios were still in their infancy, when television and jet planes were unheard of, and when transatlantic communications were reduced to long sea voyages, is an indication of what a Black man and woman can do when determined to place their lives at the service of their suffering race.

Garvey was a man of action. No sooner had he seen the need for a powerful, independent political movement that would group Blacks from all corners of the globe into a single body, than he set out to build it. In 1914, the U.N.I.A. was born. It was a Black national-separatist movement of an international character. At the height of its activity, its membership numbered in the millions. Garvey travelled (many times *on foot!*) through parts of Central and South America, the Caribbean and throughout the United States, organizing chapters of the U.N.I.A., instilling confidence in the downtrodden Black masses of those areas. Wherever he

went he summoned the Blacks to their feet, to the accomplishment of a high mission—the redemption of their race. Had Garvey been able to go on to India, Africa and Oceania, he would have gone there as well with the same message to the Black men and women of those areas. Both from a cultural and from a geographical standpoint, Garvey's thinking defied all frontiers.

Seeing as well the need for an independent medium of expression for national-separatist ideas, Garvey founded in 1919, the weekly English-language newspaper, *The Negro World*, which at its zenith contained articles in both Spanish and French. He later launched in 1922 a daily newspaper, *The Negro Times*, and in 1933 he published a monthly magazine entitled, *Black Man*. He was also to establish the first independent Black publishing company, the *Universal Publishing House*.

To finance his movement and publication, Garvey did not depend on "friendly" whites but on the independent means of Black people. Consequently, he launched various business enterprises and small-scale industries (such as the *Negro Factories Corporation*). Out of the combined profits of these different enterprises and the payment of membership dues which flowed into the U.N.I.A. treasury, Garvey embarked on a still larger commercial scheme: the purchase of several maritime vessels which he rechristened after prominent Black figures of the past (i.e., *S.S. Frederick Douglass*, *S.S. Booker T. Washington*, *S.S. Antonio Maceo*, *The Phyllis Wheatley*, etc.).

Calling upon all Black men and women who had military, technical and medical skills, Garvey set out on the second leg of his program: the establishment of a Black national-separatist armed force. By mid-1920, the *African Legion*, the *African Motor Corps*, the *Black Flying Eagles*

and the *Juvenile Corps* were formed, along with the *Universal Black Cross Nurses*.

In August of 1920, with delegates from various parts of the Black world assisting, the first *International Convention of the Negro Peoples of the World* was convened in New York. After thirty days of full deliberations, the convention issued a "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World," condemning the enslavement and colonization of the Black world—particularly Africa—by the Aryan powers. When the U.N.I.A. band struck the last chords of the new anthem, "Ethiopia, Thou Land of Our Fathers," and as thousands of Black men and women in tears sang its chorus, the Provisional Government of the African Republic was proclaimed. Garvey was unanimously chosen as the Provisional President. The aim of the U.N.I.A. was now crystal clear.

In face of the new threat which had appeared quite unsuspectedly, the Aryan powers wasted no time. One by one, the U.N.I.A. ships (which by then had been making regular trips to the Caribbean and Central America and back to the United States) were sabotaged. Thousands of U.N.I.A. members were harassed and arrested in various countries under the most varied charges. The American State Department declared that Garvey was "an undesirable and indeed a very dangerous alien," whose aim was to pit "all of the Negroes in the world against the white people."³

Rumors of a Provisional African Government in exile had already gone as far as South Africa. The governments of England, Italy, Belgium and France communicated to the

3. R.W.F., Office of the Solicitor, Memo to Doughton, June 21, 1921, State Department Files, 811.108G 191/31, National Archives (In: Edmund Cronon, *Black Moses*, University of Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin, 1964 reprinting, p. 89.)

United States government their deep concern over the activities of the U.N.I.A. and its founder. Blaise Diagne, a Senegalese member of the French Chamber of Deputies, a staunchly pro-colonialist buffoon, was prompted by the French government to reject, "in the name of Africans," the Provisional African Government in exile. Diagne issued the following bootlicking "warning" to Garvey: "We *French* natives wish to remain French, since France has given us every liberty and since she has unreservedly accepted us upon the same basis as her own European children. None of us aspires to see French Africa delivered exclusively to the Africans as is demanded, though without any authority, by the American Negroes at the head of whom you have placed yourself."⁴

A group of bootlicking Blacks, calling itself the "Committee of Eight" (among whom were prominent members of the U.S. Communist Party), petitioned the American government to arrest Garvey and disband his "dangerous" organization. Their slogan was: "Garvey Must Go!"

A few passages from the letter this "Committee of Eight" sent on January 15, 1923 to the U.S. Attorney-General, Harry M. Daugherty, will reveal the treacherous nature of those lackeys (i.e., Chandler Owen, George W. Harris, Robert W. Bagnall, William Pickens, Julia P. Coleman, John E. Nail, Robert S. Abbott, Harry H. Pace):

"Dear Sir:

As the chief law enforcement officer of the nation, we wish to call your attention to a heretofore unconsider-

4. Blaise Diagne to Marcus Garvey, July 3, 1922, quoted in Henri Charpin, "La Question Noire," *Revue Indigene*, XVII, November-December 1922, p. 281 (In: E. Cronon, *Black Moses*, op. cit., pp. 127-128, our italics.)

ed menace to harmonious race relationships. There are in our midst certain Negro criminals and potential murderers, both foreign and American born, who are moved and actuated by intense hatred against the white race. These undesirables continually proclaim that all white people are enemies to the Negro.

... Its present and moving spirit is one Marcus Garvey, an unscrupulous demagogue, who has ceaselessly and assiduously sought to spread among Negroes distrust and hatred of all white people.

The official organ of the U.N.I.A., The Negro World, . . . sedulously and continually seeks to arouse ill-feeling between the races. . . .

The U.N.I.A. is composed chiefly of the most primitive and ignorant element of West Indian and American Negroes. . . . In short, this organization is composed in the main of Negro sharks and ignorant Negro fanatics. . . .

For the above reasons we advocate that the Attorney-General use his full influence completely to disband and extirpate this vicious movement, and that he vigorously and speedily push the government's case against Marcus Garvey. . . .

We desire the Department of Justice to understand that those who draft this document . . . sound this tocsin only because they foresee the gathering storm of race prejudice and sense the imminent menace of this insidious movement, which cancerlike, is gnawing at the very vitals of peace and safety—of civic harmony and interracial concord."⁵

In June 1923, Marcus Garvey was sentenced to a five-year imprisonment term and locked up in the Tombs Prison of New York City. His followers, making every possible sac-

rifice, managed to raise the \$25,000 demanded for his bail. Garvey was released from prison in September 1923, determined more than ever before to realize the emancipation of the Black race.

U.N.I.A. delegations had already gone to Liberia for land and settlement negotiations. In December 1923, Garvey was informed that the Liberian government had agreed to provide the U.N.I.A. with a landing base in Africa. However, in face of the threat of invasion waved by England, France, Italy, Belgium and the United States, the treacherous Liberian "leaders" quickly capitulated. The first party of U.N.I.A. technical experts which arrived in Liberia in the latter part of 1924, with thousands of dollars worth of material, were promptly arrested and deported. The supplies and machinery were confiscated and eventually sold by Liberian President King. The Liberian government announced that if Garvey himself came, he would be arrested and placed at the disposal of the British authorities. But there was no need for this. On February 8, 1925, Marcus Garvey was once again brutally seized by the American authorities, handcuffed and imprisoned this time in Atlanta, Georgia. That same year, two babies were born, one in the Congo and one in Nebraska, U.S.A.: the first was named Patrice Lumumba, the second Malcolm Little.

Following the second imprisonment of Garvey, a real campaign of terror was unleashed against Garveyites throughout North, Central and South America and the Caribbean. Garveyites were beaten in the streets, shot in dark alleys, fired from their jobs and railroaded to prison under any and all charges. Garvey, himself, had been pre-

5. *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, compiled by Amy Jacques Garvey, Frank Cass & Co., Ltd., London, 1967, 2nd edition, Part II, 295, 299, 300.

viously wounded by assassin's bullets. And many were the Garveyites who were murdered in "mysterious" circumstances.

The U.S. Communist Party, directly under the orders of the Communist International, was more than once implicated in the harassment of U.N.I.A. members. Goons of the U.S. Communist Party broke up U.N.I.A. meetings with physical violence. Chiefly through the voice of George Padmore—a then prominent Black figurehead in the Communist International—marxists throughout the world were urged to "vigorously" uproot Garveyism.

In his capacity as Executive Secretary of the "International Trade Union Committee of Negro Workers" and Editor-in-Chief of its official organ, the *Negro Worker*, Padmore was assigned the task of organizing the struggle against Garveyism on an international level. An example of the campaign unleashed by the Communist International, can be gotten from Padmore's vicious tirades against Garvey and the U.N.I.A. during this period:

"The struggle against Garveyism represents one of the major tasks of Negro workers in America and in the colonies of Africa and the Caribbean. Why must we combat Garveyism? For the simple reason that, as justly stated in the program of the Communist International, '*Garveyism constitutes a dangerous ideology which bears not a single democratic trait and which toys with the aristocratic attributes of a non-existent Negro Kingdom. It must be vigorously combatted since far from being a help, it is an obstacle, blocking the struggle of the Negro Masses. . . .*' Garvey is much more than a dishonest demagogue who had profited from the wave of revolutionary protest of Negro workers. . . . Garvey . . . is an agent of American imperialism. . . . (T)he Garveyist

ideology is the most reactionary expression of Negro nationalism. . . . The landlords and black capitalists who support Garveyism have only one objective: to mobilize Negro peasants and workers to create a Negro republic in Africa. . . . Garveyism is alien to the best interests of Negro workers. . . . Negro workers should not be deceived by the demagogic actions of Garvey and his partisans. They must understand that the only road by which they can acquire their freedom and emancipation, is by organizing their forces . . . and establishing an alliance with white workers. . . ."⁶

George Padmore was not the only Black spokesman of the Aryan Left against Garveyism. There were several other subservient characters (such as, W. Adolphus Domingo, William Patterson, James W. Ford, Cyril Briggs, Chandler Owen, Richard B. Moore, Otto Huiswood and A. Philip Randolph) who were then affiliated with either the American Communist or Socialist party. Also to be found in the ranks of the prominent, Black anti-Garvey stooges of the Left during the 1920-30's, was the Trinidadian left-wing assimilationist, C. L. R. James (alias, J. R. Johnson). C. L. R. James, who was affiliated with the trotskyist brand of marxism (an offshoot of the Communist International), be-

6. George Padmore, "La Vie et les Luttres des Travailleurs Nègres," *Petite Bibliothèque de l'Internationale Syndicale Rouge*, No. XXXVII, Paris, France, no date given, pp. 163 & 164 (Our translation and italics).

It is ironic that the same Padmore who, in the name of communist "colorless fraternity," slandered Garvey as an "agent of imperialism," a "black racist," a "reactionary" and "demagogue," would, in 1934, break with the Communist International and accuse it of "betrayal of the fundamental interests of my people."!! (See: James R. Hooker, *Black Revolutionary*, Praeger Publishers, New York, 2nd printing, 1970, p. 31; also see: George Padmore's *Pan-Africanism or Communism?* Dennis Dobson, London, 1956).

came notorious for his vicious attacks against Garvey and the U.N.I.A. Like others of his kind, this marxist-trotskyist spared no efforts in venting his hatred and scorn for all that Garvey and the U.N.I.A. represented.

Using both crude anti-Black propaganda and black-skinned puppets—plus repeated attempts at assassinating the leader of the U.N.I.A.—the international Aryan Left made a concerted offensive to destroy both Garvey and his movement. In face of this offensive, Garvey would later draw the appropriate conclusions: "Communism among Negroes . . . represented . . . by such Negroes as Cyril Briggs, and W. A. Domingo, and my contact with, and experience of them and their methods are enough to keep me shy of . . . communism for the balance of my natural life," he exclaimed bitterly.⁷ "A group of men of any *ism* or party who would seek to kill or illegally or improperly dispose of a political adversary because he doesn't agree with his particular brand of politics, are no association for those who seek the perfection of Government."⁸ Garvey continued: "Because I sought to build up in Africa a democratic Negro State and not a Commune, the Negro Communists preferred me dead than alive. . . . I pray the day will never come for the Negro . . . when the Government falls into the hands of such representatives of Communism. I would rather be dead than alive under Government administered by such characters."⁹

7. *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, op. cit., Part II, pp. 333-334.

8. Ibid., Part II, p. 334 (Our italics.)

9. *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, Ibid., Part II, p. 334.

Garvey's indictment of the nefarious character of those Blacks who embrace the marxist-leninist philosophy and of the vicious role assigned to them thereafter, is far from having lost its actuality!

As the brunt of repression fell upon the first universal, national-separatist movement of this century, the traitors, mercenaries and opportunists who had sought to make a career within the ranks of the U.N.I.A. surfaced. No sooner had Garvey been released from the Atlanta prison and deported from the United States in 1927, than the fight had begun over who would be the leader of the U.N.I.A. In time, the U.N.I.A. leadership was to be immobilized by a crippling internecine struggle of succession.

Following the directives of the U.S. Communist International, Black members of the U.S. Communist Party had infiltrated the U.N.I.A. and were at work in their nefarious task of tearing down the organization from within. Paid agents of the United States F.B.I. had also heavily infiltrated the ranks of the U.N.I.A. By 1935, the U.N.I.A., as it once stood, had been systematically dismantled in every country. Eventually the Universal Negro Improvement Association was to crumble under the combined blows of the enemy from without and the traitor from within.

In desperation, Garvey, who was hounded wherever he went by the security forces of the chief Aryan nations, tried to pick up the pieces of the world-wide movement he had created. Banned from entering most countries, Garvey was practically restricted to England. Nonetheless, our hero struggled. Over and over again, he tried to reorganize the U.N.I.A. When Ethiopia was invaded by Mussolini's Italy in 1935, it was Garvey who rushed to the defense of Africa, calling upon the Blacks of the world to mobilize and organize their forces on the side of Ethiopia and come to the aid of their African brothers. To this end he devoted his every effort in spite of a steadily declining health.

As the generalized European war broke out in 1939-40, Garvey was cut off forever in London from the Black world.

Sick, disheartened, sad and alone, the hero died on June 10, 1940.

Garvey's farewell address to his followers as he was railroaded to the Atlanta, Georgia prison, may well have been his last testament:

"(I)n life or death I shall come back to you to serve even as I have served before. In life I shall be the same: in death I shall be a terror to the foes of Negro liberty. If death has power, then count on me in death to be the real Marcus Garvey I would like to be. If I may come in an earthquake, or a cyclone, or plague, or pestilence . . . then be assured that I shall never desert you and make your enemies triumph over you. Would I not go to hell a million times for you? Would I not . . . walk the earth forever for you? Would I not lose the whole world and eternity for you? Would I not cry forever . . . for you? Then, why be sad? Cheer up, and be assured that if it takes a million years the sins of our enemies shall visit the millionth generation of those that hinder and oppress us. . . .

If I die in Atlanta my work shall then only begin, but I shall live, in the physical or spiritual to see the day of Africa's glory. When I am dead wrap the mantle of the Red, Black and Green around me, for in the new life I shall rise . . . to lead the millions up the heights of triumph with the colors that you well know. Look for me in the whirlwind or the storm, look for me all around you, for . . . I shall come and bring with me countless millions of black slaves who have died in America and the West Indies and the millions in Africa to aid you in the fight for Liberty, Freedom and Life."¹⁰

10. *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, Ibid., Part II, pp. 238-239.

CHAPTER 2

MYTHS AND FALLACIES
ABOUT GARVEY

Prior to, and after his death, Aryan propaganda has devised every imaginable charge against Marcus Garvey. His far-ranging appeal among Black people has been termed "demagogy." In spite of his scrupulous integrity, the charge of "swindler" has been levelled against him. His passionate love for the Black race has been called "black chauvinism." And to cap it all, Garvey is said to have advocated a policy of "racial purity" which excluded all but the so-called *full-blooded* members of the Black race, whatever that term may signify. This is the only charge we will deal with, since it's the only one which seems to have stuck with a great many Black people.

The fallacy that Garvey was against light-skinned Blacks as such, and that he was more violently against the fair-skinned segments of the race than he was against the whites themselves, is not novel. This falsehood was levelled against the U.N.I.A. during Garvey's lifetime. As is to be expected, the most active propagators of this fallacy were those light-

skinned elements in the Americas whose systematic collusion with white supremacy, and arrogant disdain for Blackness, Garvey unhesitatingly challenged.

First of all, it must be said that Garvey wasn't the one who drove a wedge between light-skinned and dark-skinned Blacks. This antagonism within the Black race has persisted intensely *everywhere* for many centuries. It's origin? It is Aryan domination which is responsible for the ethnic fragmentation of the Black race. It is the Aryan who has fostered and sustained it for centuries. It is the Aryan, and only the Aryan, who draws the fullest economic and political advantages from its maintenance.

/ White supremacy has split the Black world asunder ethnically. Pitting straight-haired Blacks against curly-haired Blacks; setting narrow-nosed Blacks against broad-nosed Blacks; inflaming light-skinned Blacks against dark-skinned Blacks; opposing Blacks of African origin to those of Asian origin; and finally, pitting the Blacks of the Americas against those of Africa and Asia. There is no end to the variety of divisions fostered by white supremacy in the Black world. In this respect, we should remember that the Haitian Revolution of 1804 did not succumb to the might of Aryan armies but to the might of this fierce antagonism between light-skinned and dark-skinned Blacks.

Garvey was one of the first Black men to set out to close our ranks, to bring us together into one, healthy, strong, proud body. No one has worked more for the ethnic unification of the race than he. Throughout his active political life, Garvey never ceased promoting racial unity between all Black morphological types, regardless of their skin color or other physical features. And any Black person who reads what Garvey said himself, and not what has been said about

him, will see that this was one of the capital points he stressed time and time again.

Now, what Garvey did attack was the assimilationist, integrationist Black—of whatever hue he may be—who predicated the falsehood that the “salvation” of the Black man was dependent upon his ability to “become” an Aryan even in physical appearance. Garvey clearly exposed the class of traitors from within our fold, those lackeys and mercenaries of white supremacy who have historically sold out the race for less than breadcrumbs. When Garvey assailed Blacks for hating their blackness, when he pointed to the spoken or unspoken desire of Blacks in general to escape from the race, he was not pointing to light-skinned Blacks exclusively. He was pointing at *any* Black person who, by his shame of blackness, sought to escape the race either by denying his Blackness or worshipping at the altar of miscegenation.

Dominated by an intense hatred of their blackness, light-skinned Blacks in general fiercely opposed and attacked Garvey's efforts to instill all Black people with a sense of racial pride. Their opposition to Garveyism was not due to any personally-directed attack of Garvey against light-skinned Blacks. Historically, the fairer-skinned elements of the Black race, more than anyone else, have systematically sought to “whiten” the race through a policy of racial amalgamation with the Aryan. Their political role as “buffers” in the Black world has been consistently nefarious.

Does this mean that the only traitors in the Black race are those with light-skins? Far from it. The traitors from within the race are of *all skin colors*. No one was more aware of this than Garvey. The difference between the dark-skinned and light-skinned traitor, is that, in general, the latter uses his lighter pigmentation to assert himself—in a racist fashion—as “superior” to all those of darker complex-

ion. This explains why, in face of Garvey who physically represented all that he hated, the assaults of the light-skinned lackey of Aryan oppression, bore definite racist overtones. Some of these bootlickers even described Garvey as an “ugly black man,” a “flat-nosed demagogue” of “unmixed stock,” with “protruding jaws and heavy jowels,” while others called him a “gorilla-jawed black man.”

This brings us to another aspect of the question of light-skinned—vs—dark-skinned Blacks in relation to Garvey and the U.N.I.A. There is a widespread opinion among old-line Garveyites that it was the light-skinned Blacks who were responsible for the destruction of the U.N.I.A., the imprisonment of Garvey and the sabotage of the Garveyist program altogether. For people who dare call themselves Garveyites, such an opinion shows how little they understand about the political, economic and racial forces which acted to thwart the implementation of the U.N.I.A.'s titanic program. Have they forgotten that it is the Aryan who rules the world? Were the traitors within the U.N.I.A. fair-skinned Blacks? Were the treacherous Liberian authorities, headed by President King and Co., light-skinned Blacks? Either these fossilized “Garveyites” are wholly ignorant of the facts surrounding the sabotage of the U.N.I.A.'s program, or they are consciously bent upon exonerating the *real* forces that combatted Garveyism down to the end. These forces were none other than the international forces of Black oppression, both Right (capitalist) and Left (communist).

CHAPTER 3

THE MEANING OF GARVEYISM

WAS THE U.N.I.A. A "FAILURE," AS SOME would claim? Did Garvey "fail" in his enterprise? Garvey did not fail. The establishment in Africa of a Black political, economic, industrial, military, cultural and scientific bastion from which the entire African continent first, and the rest of the Black world secondly, could be liberated, was the high task Garvey had set for himself. Although he was kept from accomplishing this goal by the concerted action of the leading Aryan powers of the world—both capitalist and communist—his other accomplishments were gigantic.

Garvey organized, as best he could, the first national-separatist *movement* of this century. He *mobilized*, as none had done before him, the national-separatist aspirations of tens of millions of Blacks the world over. He began the organization of an embryonic national-separatist *army*. He had a *program* which was national-separatist and he had a national-separatist *class* that backed him. He lacked only a

national-separatist *ideology* and a *country* where he could implement the national-separatist program of the U.N.I.A.

Garvey was the first Black internationalist of this century. No one strove to mobilize and unify Black people the world over as he. As Lumumba and Malcolm X after him, Marcus Garvey had what few of us possess: a deep, genuinely sincere love for all Black people, a love of the race which cuts across any and all differences of country, culture, language, skin color and morphology. His racial love was based on the historical experience common to Black men and women everywhere. It wasn't sentiment or emotion that instilled Garvey with Black love. A correct historical perspective is what made his love so profound for us. History revealed to Garvey that we were once a great and mighty people and that we could be a great and mighty people again if only we would have self-confidence, pride in race, pride in our blackness, and *firmly close our ranks*.

Independent Black nation-building as Garvey envisioned it, is still to be realized. There isn't a single country in the world today where the Black man can raise his head in pride, knowing that he is in control of that country's industrial, commercial and scientific development—let alone the master of his own armed forces, his own government. Nothing could be further from Garvey's objective than the present so-called "independent" Black nations in Africa, Asia, Oceania, South and Central America and the Caribbean. The chief aim of these "independent" governments is to have a seat in the so-called United Nations. Their role in the world is reduced to facilitating the exploitation of their respective countries by Aryan powers. These fictitious independent governments are but the national watchdogs of international Aryan economic, political, military and cultural interests. It

was precisely these interests that Garvey sought to destroy.

A half-a-century ago, Garvey saw things that we have yet to see. He clarified issues for us that we're still confused over today. He defined the correct line of thought and action that every conscious Black man and woman should follow in the pursuit of their emancipation. We must resurrect Garvey the visionary, the theoretician and the man of action. Here was a man who saw the overall needs of the Black world and who set out to fulfill those needs in ways that defy our own narrow-minded imaginations. Here was a man who didn't wait for his fellow man to do the job that he, as a Black man, had to accomplish.

Garvey was a man with a vision, not a dream. His vision was not "ahead of his time," as some would say. The vision, or goal, of a thoroughly emancipated Black race, of a race united and powerful, can never be ahead of the time of anybody. It was this vision that was at the base of the Black Haitian Revolution of 1804. Was Dessalines ahead of his time? Was Christophe ahead of his time? Were the Black masses in Haiti ahead of their times when they struck out to implement what Garvey sought to bring about in the 1920's, what Lumumba tried to build in 1960, and what Malcolm X died to accomplish in the early 1960's? Garvey was not "ahead of his time." It is the Black race as a whole which has been dragging itself for centuries *behind* the times. This is the historically tragic situation that Garvey tried to upset with the meagre means he had at his disposal.

Was he an "exceptional" man, as some would again try to say? Or was he the type of man that we should all strive to be in view of our history? Garvey was certainly no exceptional man. He was just like each one of us; initially with the same weaknesses, confusion and undetermination that charac-

terizes men and women who belong to an oppressed, enslaved and brutally exploited race. He was not a man beyond the reach of any of us. It is important to realize this because deceptive propaganda is seeking today to make us complacent with our own weaknesses, confusion and undetermination by subtly implying that he who raises himself beyond this level, is an "exceptional Negro."

What made Garvey what he was, can make us what we ought to be in view of our history. In his own words, we have a vivid description of the nature of our weaknesses, confusion and undetermination—the very source of our personal failures as individuals, and collective failures as a race. Listen to Garvey again:

"Where can we find in this race of ours real men. Men of character, men of purpose, men of confidence, men of faith, men who really know themselves?

. . . So few of us can understand what it takes to make a man—the man who will never say die; the man who will never give up; the man who will never depend upon others to do for him what he ought to do for himself; the man who will not blame God, who will not blame Nature, who will not blame Fate for his condition; but the man will go out and make conditions to suit himself. Oh, how disgusting life becomes when on every hand you hear people (who bear your image, who bear your resemblance) telling you that they cannot make it, that Fate is against them, that they cannot get a chance. If . . . Negroes can only get to know themselves, to know that in them is a sovereign power, is an authority that is absolute, then in the next twenty-four hours we would have a new race, we would have a nation . . . resurrected, not from the will of others to

see us rise—but from our own determination to rise, irrespective of what the world thinks.”¹

This is what the real Garvey, our Marcus Garvey taught us. And this is the only Garvey we recognize.

Part Two

PATRICE LUMUMBA

1. *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, Ibid., Part I, pp. 30-31.

CHAPTER 1

LUMUMBA AND THE
"INDEPENDENCE" OF THE CONGO

MANY OF US HAVE ACCEPTED THE ARYAN version of why massive turmoil and utter chaos greeted the proclamation of Congolese "independence." According to this widely diffused version, it was the *Congolese people* who were "unprepared" for independence. To back this up, we are told that on June 30, 1960 (date of the Congo's fictitious independence), there were only a handful of Congolese who had "attended a university." Since when is a sizeable number of university degree-holders the "prerequisite" of independence? By whose criteria is independence based on the greater or lesser number of so-called educated people in a country? Was Haiti "unprepared" for independence in 1804? How can one justify the notion that the Black masses of any part of the Black world are "unprepared" to *regain* an independence which was *taken away* through Aryan aggressions?

To say that the Congolese people were "unprepared" or "unqualified" for the obtention of their freedom from facist European colonial enslavement is to argue in favor of coloni-

zation as a factor of "civilization" and "advancement." Those African or non-African Blacks who seek to explain their peaceful and cordial "transition" from a colonial status to an "independent" one, with the argument that they had been "well prepared" by their colonial masters, are accrediting a white supremacist falsehood. Moreover, the facts will show that from a statistical standpoint, *the conditions of illiteracy prevailing in the Congo on "independence" day were no different from those of any other African state declared "independent."* Where is the difference, then, from one "independence" to another?

Why was Patrice Lumumba the only leader who was harassed, slandered and attacked *from the very beginning*, while all other "leaders" who have "led their country to independence" were applauded and encouraged by *one camp or another* of the Aryan world? Why was the Congo's "independence" so *unusual*? Why did the Congo's first Prime Minister meet such a swift and brutal death, only six months after the proclamation of "independence?" What caused the entire Aryan world to come down on Lumumba's head and that of the Congo with such a crushing and devastating force? Why did Lumumba pose such an imminent threat to international white supremacy? Why did he have to bear the most terrible blows that any single Black leader has had to withstand, and all in the space of 200 days?

Patrice Lumumba took the Aryan world by surprise on June 30, 1960. Of this there can be no doubt. Before that time, there were only inklings of a national-separatist Lumumba. A reading of his *Congo My Country*, written in 1956, will no doubt be a shock to us today when compared with his statements from June 30th onwards. His lavish praise for the Belgian butchers and their work of "civilization" in Africa would later turn into violent condemnations

of Aryan domination and oppression of the Black man. This paradox can have only one explanation: from 1956 onwards, Lumumba's political thinking was quickly moving from a position of integrationist-assimilationism to one of national-separatism.

Already in March 1959 at the International Seminar held at Ibadan University in Nigeria, Lumumba was to state: "Our only objective is to rid Africa of colonialism and imperialism. We have suffered long enough; today, we want to breathe the air of liberty. This portion of the earth—the African continent . . . *belongs to us* and we are, in fact, its only masters."¹ This was no mere "anti-colonial" rhetoric. Nor was it an outburst of a "nationalism" easily appeased with a high ministerial post, a big-sounding title or a fat salary provided by the international Aryan concerns which plunder Africa's riches. This was a clear statement of *national-separatist* intransigence.²

Distinct echoes of national-separatism are also to be found in *Congo My Country*. In less than five years, these echoes were to develop into an uncompromising national-separatist posture. When, in *Congo My Country*, Lumumba said that "A man without nationalistic tendencies is a man

1. *La Pensée Politique de Patrice Lumumba*, Edited by Jean Van Lierde, Présence Africaine, Paris, France, 1963, p. 26 (Our translation and italics).

2. In his "Oh Black Man, Beloved Brother," a poem written in September 1959, Patrice Lumumba set down some of the thoughts which were beginning to reshape his entire political, cultural and racial outlook. Unfortunately, we are unable to reproduce here this strong statement of Lumumba's belief in Black brotherhood and of his burning hatred for white supremacist domination. (See *La Pensée Politique de Patrice Lumumba*, Ibid., pp. 69-70).

without a soul,"³ he had actually taken the first step which on June 30, 1960, would make him shout to the Aryan world: "From today we are no longer your *Makak!*" (monkeys).⁴

On the day that the Congo was declared "independent," with Patrice Lumumba as its Prime Minister, the Belgian colonialists had not planned for Lumumba to make any speech whatsoever. What a shock it was for them when Lumumba rose to his feet, seized the microphone and, in his memorable speech of June 30th, told his people that the colonization of the Congo was nothing other than the *domination of the whites over the Blacks*. Demystifying the colonization he had himself once termed a "work of civilization," he now lashed out against the "humiliating slavery which was *imposed on us by force*" and reminded millions of Blacks of "the insults (and) blows we were made to endure morning, noon and night *because we were Blacks*."⁵

Such words were never uttered by any contemporary Black "leader" to their people, either on the day of "independence" or on any day thereafter. This fact alone establishes a neat dividing line between Lumumba and any other "leader" who has "come to power" through an arrangement with the dominating Aryan powers.

From his speech of June 30th, it was clear that Lumumba had assigned no small role to the Congo and its people: "Together, my brothers, my sisters, we are going to begin *a new struggle*—a sublime struggle that will take our coun-

3. Patrice Lumumba, *Congo My Country*, Frederick A. Praeger, London, 3rd printing, 1969, p. 173.

4. *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

5. *La Pensée Politique de Patrice Lumumba*, op. cit., p. 198 (Our translation, parenthesis and italics).

try to peace, prosperity and *grandeur*."⁶ Then, voicing the innermost aspirations of more than a billion Black men and women the world over, Lumumba summoned the Black Congo to its feet: "LET US SHOW THE WORLD WHAT THE BLACK MAN CAN DO WHEN HE WORKS IN FREEDOM."⁷

In a single powerful statement, Patrice Lumumba had engaged 30 million Congolese on the path of Dessalines and Christophe. He had reestablished the link with the struggle of Samory, Dingane, N'Zinga and Bambaata. He had resurrected Garvey. To Lumumba, the Congo was to become *a bastion*—a bastion for the Black man, a bastion for Africa, a bastion for the Black world. The international Aryan enterprise of murder, enslavement, oppression and exploitation of the Black race was quick to realize Lumumba's historical identity. On that very day of June 30, 1960, Lumumba's fate was sealed.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 199 (Our translation and italics).

7. *La Pensée Politique de Patrice Lumumba*, *Ibid.*, p. 199 (Our translation and caps).

CHAPTER 2

THE ARYAN OFFENSIVE
AGAINST LUMUMBA

Out of all those who had been assigned posts in the Congo's government, Patrice Lumumba was one of the very few who believed that the Congo *could* truly be independent and that power could truly pass into the hands of the Blacks. Anyone who will inform himself thoroughly about the circumstances leading up to, and surrounding, the fictitious granting of independence to the Congo, will see that Lumumba acted on this premise. What is amazing is that Lumumba even managed to survive the night following "independence" day.

Hardly twenty-four hours had elapsed before the international Aryan press began reporting "unrest" in the Congo. The very first week of "independence" was greeted by statements of Aryan powers concerning their "preoccupation" over the "situation" in the Congo and their "anxiety" over the safety of European nationals there. No sooner had these declarations been made than the Aryan press began headlining news of "large-scale unrest" and the outbreak of "trib-

al warfare." As such news became increasingly widespread, the Belgian government announced its intention of using its troops (which had never left the Congo) to "insure the safety" of the white settlers who were there. One of the most sinister anti-Black plots in the history of the Black world had begun.

Lumumba's immediate realization was that he had no armed forces that could oust the Belgian troops from the two huge military installations of Kamina and Kitona, and stop the incoming Belgian contingents of paratroopers. His appeal to Belgium to withdraw its troops and cease the ensuing massacre of thousands of Blacks, was in vain. His appeal to the Aryan powers to force Belgium to cease its aggression, was also in vain.

As the white aggressor troops ravaged entire villages, they spread in their wake the machiavellic lie that it was Lumumba himself who had ordered these killings! Not only death, but confusion as well was sown by the Aryan bayonet. When Lumumba attempted to go personally by airplane to the areas where his people were being slaughtered, the Prime Minister was *refused* by the white pilots—the only pilots in the Congo. In desperation, Lumumba appealed for help from the "independent" nations of Africa. Nothing! Turning to the so-called Afro-Asian bloc, Lumumba then sought its help. Nothing!

Less than two weeks after "independence," the Congo was being torn asunder. Tribes were pitted against each other in fratricidal warfare. Belgian troops were sowing terror throughout every corner of that vast country. At the instigation of its Belgian superior officers, the Congolese pseudo-army staged a mutiny in demand for higher wages—wages that weren't demanded before. Unscrupulous, power-hungry hirelings of Aryan domination (such as Tshombe,

Kalondji, Munongo, Mobutu, Kasavubu, etc.) were busy plotting to keep the Congo firmly in the hands of its Aryan masters.

Against this background of sudden chaos, inter-Black throat-cutting, the massacre by Belgian soldiers of thousands of Black men, women and children and, in addition, assassination plots from the very men who were part of his entourage, Lumumba realized another source of weakness: the absence of a powerful and well-structured national-separatist movement. His M.N.C. (Mouvement National Congolais) which had mobilized the people for independence was definitely *not* such a movement.

Who were the leading men around Lumumba? Who were his ministers and trusted aides? The greater part of those who surrounded him (calling themselves "Lumumbists") were nothing but career-seeking opportunists. Almost to the last man, these "Lumumbists" were 100% *assimilationists*. Secretly, they were opposed to Lumumba's actions. Their dreams of becoming fat, corrupt and complacent bureaucrats under the shadow of a fictitious independence were being shattered. In their opinion, Lumumba was "messing up their chances." The angry reaction of most was to waste no time in placing themselves at the feet of their Aryan masters. Others were readily enjoying their new roles as Cabinet Ministers. At an hour when the Congo was being torn asunder by an unimagineable series of Aryan-fostered intrigues, one such minister even installed a bed right in his office, not for the purpose of working twenty-four hours a day, but for his own personal "peace-making" activities with the "friendly" European females who began showing up in the Congo's capital disguised as journalists!

As one desertion after another depleted the ranks of the "Lumumbist" leadership, Lumumba was left with only a

handful of loyal collaborators. It had become evident that he suffered from still another great source of weakness: the absence of a national-separatist *class*, dedicated to the accomplishment of a free, independent and united Africa. The broad masses of the people were Lumumbists. None had summoned their national-separatist aspirations as Lumumba. Yet it was a mediocre, petty bourgeois, assimilationist class that surrounded Lumumba. To this class, independence was not the means of liberating the Congo, the African continent, and the rest of the Black world from Aryan domination and exploitation, but the road towards satisfying thoroughly *integrationist* aims and a means of personal enrichment.

In a chain of upsetting events, one tragedy succeeded another. The entire Black world watched impotently as low-down, despicable creatures, headed by Moïse Tshombe of Katanga, announced on July 11th the "secession" of the cobalt and uranium-charged Katanga Province. Both South Africa and the white regime of "Rhodesia" (then headed by Roy Welensky) swiftly dispatched aides to the newly proclaimed "republic." From the neighboring Portuguese colony of Angola came white mercenaries. Huge quantities of weapons flowed into Katanga, coming from West Germany, England, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy and South Africa. The rest of the country was held in check by 10,000 Belgian troops. Rumors were also spreading that President Kasavubu intended to proclaim himself "king" of a secessionist Bakongo state.

After nearly all of his calls for help had fallen on deaf ears, Lumumba decided to follow the advice of one renowned African leader, who himself was being "advised" by the Soviet Union. Consequently, Lumumba requested the so-called United Nations to immediately dispatch troops to suppress the Aryan-inspired secession of Katanga, oust the Belgium

troops, and cut off the inflow of mercenaries invading the Congo from Angola and "Rhodesia."

From all evidence, the U.N. was *already* prepared to send troops into the Congo, for no sooner had Lumumba requested the U.N.'s military aid on July 12th, than 25,000 U.N. troops were hastily dispatched to the Congo. Lumumba had walked right into the trap. The first evidence of this was reflected in the politico-racial composition of the U.N. forces: (a) the backbone of the U.N. forces was provided by *Scandinavian, Canadian and Irish* troops; (b) the African troops were, for the most part, drawn from countries entirely subjected to Aryan control and domination; (c) the 25,000 U.N. troops were under a predominantly *white* High Military Command.

Lumumba soon realized that he had fallen into a pre-arranged trap by calling in the U.N. On August 8th, with the connivance and full support of the U.N., another contemptible character, Albert Kalondji, declared the "secession" of the diamond-rich South Kasai Province. With the earlier "secession" of Katanga and now that of Kasai, Lumumba had lost control of the Congo's two richest provinces. Their strategic importance was (and is) capital. Katanga alone, provides the Aryan world (particularly the U.S.A.) with most of its uranium and cobalt—the chief strategic materials for the fabrication of atomic and thermonuclear weapons.

The U.N. troops had been in the Congo for a month, but not a single move had been made against the Katanga secessionist province. They had neither dislodged the Belgian troops, nor had they taken the least initiative to cut off the inflow of weapons and mercenaries into Katanga. Instead, the U.N. forces were busy implementing the plan decided upon by Dag Hammarskjöld (then U.N. Secretary-General)

whereby *all pro-Lumumba forces* were to be totally disarmed. Now that another "secession" had been declared *with the full endorsement of the U.N.*, it was clear that the *white* U.N. contingents and the predominantly *white* U.N. High Military Command were calling the cards. The role of the "United Nations," as merely another instrument to carry out international Aryan policies, had become obvious.

Lumumba had had enough. On August 13-14, in a violent declaration to the U.N. Secretary-General, he demanded *that all white troops and officers be immediately ousted from the U.N. forces*. The anti-Lumumba maneuvers of the Canadian, Swedish and Irish troops had become all too clear. Furthermore, it was confirmed that *Belgian* soldiers were continuing to enter the Congo under U.N. cover, dressed in Swedish, Canadian and Irish uniforms! But Lumumba's urgent demand for the expulsion of all white troops from the U.N. forces was flatly and arrogantly turned down by the U.N.'s then Scandinavian Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld! The Congo had become, at best, no more than a U.N. protectorate.

The only government in the Black world which had explicitly promised aid to Lumumba was Kwame Nkrumah's Ghana. Thus at the very height of the turmoil, when nothing short of a swift, well-coordinated military onslaught against the white forces supporting secessionist Katanga could have turned the tables, Lumumba called on Nkrumah for immediate and direct *military* aid. This was just prior to the U.N.'s entry into the picture. Nkrumah, not willing to commit himself militarily in a confrontation with the Belgian forces, dispatched instead the Chief of Defense Staff of his army to "advise" Lumumba. Patrice Lumumba must have received one of his first in a series of shocks when he discovered that the Chief of Defense Staff of Ghana's Army,

was none other than the *British* Major-General H. T. Alexander!

The 3,000 Ghanaian troops who came into the Congo, did not come in as an *independent force* as Lumumba had requested from Nkrumah. The Ghana contingent came in as Nkrumah had decided—as an integral part of the U.N. forces with Major-General Alexander as its military Chief, seconded by a host of other white (British) officers. Lumumba, who was to demand the withdrawal of *all white troops and officers* from the U.N. forces, had to face the cruel reality that even the Ghanaian forces were commanded by *white* officers. Lumumba's apprehension to this effect was to be quickly confirmed.

On September 5th, less than two months after the U.N.'s intervention, Joseph Kasavubu brought his treachery out into the open. Interrupting the normal radio broadcast, he announced that, as President of the Congo, he had decided to "dismiss" Lumumba and replace him with another Prime Minister (i.e., Joseph Ileo). Lumumba, he said, had brought "chaos" to the Congo, "provoked" the wrath of "friendly" countries, etc., etc. Lumumba, who had been totally unaware of Kasavubu's intentions, reacted vigorously. Going directly to the national radio station in Kinshasha (ex Leopoldville), he exposed Kasavubu's treachery for what it was, called on the people to rise, and confirmed that none but the people themselves could "dismiss" him as the Prime Minister.

It was during this most critical period that Lumumba had to rely, more than ever before, on radio facilities to communicate with a nation whose size is equivalent to that of France, Italy, Belgium, England, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Greece, Holland, Austria and Switzerland *put together*. But even this last bridge of communication with 30 million Congolese would be cut off dramatically. On Septem-

ber 11th, as Lumumba made his way to the capital's radio station, he came face to face with the Ghanaian forces. Not only did the Ghanaian soldiers physically prevent the Prime Minister from entering the radio station, but they threatened to shoot him and his guards if he tried to force his way in. It was now clear that the *white* commanding officers of the Ghana forces—with Major-General Alexander as the supreme boss—took their orders from Aryan headquarters, not from Accra.

In anger and desperation, Lumumba wrote immediately to Nkrumah:

"I hasten to express to you my indignation regarding *the aggressive and hostile attitude of Ghanaian soldiers towards me and my Government. . . .*

At 4:30 p.m. today, 11th September, accompanied by my soldiers I personally went to take over the radio station. The Ghana troops, however, *opposed my decision with hostility and went to the extent of seizing arms from my soldiers. The Ghana troops even wanted to shoot me and my soldiers.*

To these incidents add also the *hostile declaration of Gen. Alexander of your army against the Government of the Republic. All these acts committed by your soldiers are far from proving the friendship I wanted to maintain with you and your people. In the circumstances, I feel obliged to renounce the help of your troops in view of the fact that they are in a state of war against our Republic.* Instead of helping us in our difficulties, *your soldiers are openly siding with the enemy to fight against us.*"¹

1. Letter of Patrice Lumumba to Kwame Nkrumah; in Nkrumah's *Challenge of the Congo*, International Publishers, New York, 2nd printing, 1969, p. 39 (Our italics).

A second attempt by Lumumba to get into the radio station was once again fiercely opposed by the Ghanaian troops. Meanwhile, however, Tshombe, Kasavubu, Bolikango and other such hirelings had free access to the broadcasting facilities of neighboring countries, as well as the various radio stations of the Congo, including that of the capital from whence Lumumba had been barred entry. Ghana's Ambassador in the Congo, Mr. A. Y. K. Djin, wrote to Nkrumah:

"In a grave tone and looking very serious, Mr. Patrice Lumumba told me that he had called me to protest once more against the hostile attitude of the Ghana troops who were guarding the Radio Station against him. He said that he had sent a note of protest to (you) . . . on the previous day's incident and was very indignant that the same aggressiveness of the Ghanaian soldiers was repeated that afternoon. *Mr. Lumumba continued that he did not see the usefulness of the Ghana troops here.*

. . . Some of the soldiers, he added, even used abusive language against him. *He continued that if there was any thorn in their flesh, it was Ghana; the latter, he said, was responsible for their failure to carry out the operation to seize the Airport and the Radio Station.* What was most surprising was that the Ghanaian troops were now working for the Opposition. He could not understand why Mr. Bolikango could be allowed to enter the Broadcasting House and he the Prime Minister was refused entry.

Mr. Lumumba further said that in his first note addressed to (you) . . . he had decided to break diplomatic relations with Ghana if the Government of Ghana

would not withdraw its troops from the Radio Station. He added that his Government had now decided to give Ghana the last chance, and that within one hour, all the Ghana troops in the Congo should cease their activities. . . . If this was not carried out, his country would be compelled to sever diplomatic relations with Ghana. . . .

*. . . He regretted . . . that our system of continuing to rely on expatriates (i.e., whites) for appointment to senior posts had caused him considerable harm and embarrassment."*²

Lumumba was betrayed by one after another of those in his government; he was confronted with Belgian-inspired opposition within the ranks of the Congolese army; he was faced with the aggression of 10,000 Belgian soldiers; he was up against secessionist forces in Katanga and Kasai, backed by Belgian troops and mercenaries from South Africa, "Rhodesia," Portugal and Spain; he was opposed by the hostile 25,000 U.N. forces with its Swedish, Canadian and Irish contingents. Now, on top of all this, he was also faced with the aggressive actions of Nkrumah's 3,000 soldiers—commanded by British officers with Major-General H. T. Alexander at their head—who were bent on *disarming* the Lumumbist forces.

In another plea to Nkrumah, Patrice Lumumba entreated him to withdraw his troops from the radio station, have them break with the U.N. forces, and place them entirely at the service of the Lumumbist forces. On September 13th he wrote

"I am sorry to inform you about the hostile attitude of the Ghana troops who actually hinder the movement

2. *Challenge of the Congo*, Ibid., pp. 52 & 54 (Our italics and parenthesis).

of the Government. I would like to remind you of my letter which I sent about that subject two days ago.

Similar actions have been renewed yesterday, and I immediately got in touch with your Ambassador, Mr. Djin. I asked him to order the withdrawal of Ghana troops who were surrounding the broadcasting station. *The Government has decided to break off diplomatic relations with Ghana in case your Government refuses to withdraw its troops.*

The action taken by Ghana troops will only lead to strengthening the position of the imperialists. Ghana troops are now being used against the legally constituted Government and in the interest of the opposition. We are highly disappointed. We had hoped to find effective support from Ghana and its troops.

*My Government requests that you instruct your troops as soon as you receive this message to stop all activities within the framework of the United Nations and act only with the Government of Lumumba."*³

An example of the type of replies which Lumumba was receiving from Nkrumah can be gotten from the following letter sent by the Ghanaian President to the man he was supposed to be effectively aiding. Nkrumah wrote:

"I entirely appreciate your point of view and understand the difficult position in which you find yourself *vis-a-vis* the Ghana troops. . . . I also find myself in an embarrassing and invidious position in respect of the way in which my Ghana troops are being used in the Congo.

. . . I entreat you to be patient (sic) and calm (sic). Everything will end well provided neither you nor I take

3. Ibid., p. 48 (Our italics).

any precipitous step. *If Ghana troops are to be placed completely at your disposal, then you and your Government must find some way to declare that in this struggle, Ghana and the Congo are one. Only thus would it be possible for my Ghana troops to operate legitimately (sic) with the Congolese forces."*⁴

Backing up this letter with yet another, Nkrumah, adopting a paternalistic tone, urged and "advised" Lumumba:

"(Y)ou cannot afford . . . to be harsh (sic) and uncompromising. Do not force Kasavubu out now. . . . Do not make an issue of his treachery now, or even of Tshombe's treachery. The time will come to deal with them. Let sleeping (sic) dogs lie. Leave these people alone now. . . . Be 'as cool as a cucumber.' . . . (T)he very critical situation in the Congo demands you adopting what I call 'tactical action.' . . .

. . . I must repeat with all emphasis here . . . that you must not push the United Nations troops out until you have consolidated your position. . . .

Whenever in doubt consult me. Brother, we have been in the game for some time now and we know how to handle the imperialists and the colonialists (!!!). The only colonialist or imperialist that I trust is a dead one. If you do not want to bring Congo into ruin, follow the advice I have given. Brother, have implicit faith in me; I shall not let you down. . . .

*. . . If you fail, you have only yourself to blame and it will be due to your unwillingness to face the facts of life or as the Germans call it, 'realpolitik.' . . . Your policy 'to do away with your enemies now' will fail; you must adopt TACTICAL ACTION."*⁵

4. Ibid., pp. 41 & 42 (Our italics).

5. Ibid., pp. 43 & 46 (Our italics).

What Nkrumah describes as Lumumba's '*unwillingness to face the facts of life*,' is what history will forever relate as Patrice Lumumba's unwillingness to play games with the Aryan oppressor or capitulate to Aryan imperialistic dictums. International Aryan power said Lumumba should capitulate; Lumumba thought otherwise. Lumumba was thinking along lines that had nothing to do with German '*realpolitik*'!

Alarmed over the grave situation wherein the Ghana contingent—rather than defending the Congo—was busily thwarting every step Lumumba took to redress the situation in his favor, Ghana's Ambassador to the Congo, A. Y. K. Djin, pleaded with Nkrumah to dismiss General Alexander as well as the other white officers of the Ghanaian contingent. He immediately wrote to Nkrumah:

"If you would allow me, Osagyefo, I would say that *this is the culminating point of Gen Alexander's intrigue and subversive action which I have time and again pointed out* and which was also confirmed by all the delegations which had paid a visit to the Congo. If you remember all that I told you during my last consultations with you, you will no doubt agree that although we were responsible for making possible the independence of the Congo, *since the Country became free we have been a liability to Lumumba and the Congolese*. Without doubt, it was due to Gen Alexander's actions that Mr. Lumumba had to give notice to the United Nations to quit from the Congo.

At the moment the situation has so much deteriorated that if you still have interest in your main aim, I suggest that you (i) *dismiss Gen Alexander*, (ii) *withdraw all white soldiers from the Congo*, (iii) *stop supporting the idea of disarming the Congolese Army*, and (iv)

give strong support to the 'status quo' as against the illegal government put up by UNO."⁶

Ambassador Djin's urgent call for the immediate dismissal of General Alexander and the other white officers serving in the Ghanaian forces, fell on deaf ears. Nkrumah was no more willing to dismiss his white officers than he was to place his troops at Lumumba's disposal. Lumumba's solitude was complete—"friends" and foes alike were against him. He was encircled by a thousand and one forces which would find satisfaction in nothing but his blood. His demand that all of the U.N. forces, without exception, pack up and leave the Congo, was greeted with the satisfied smiles of the Aryan International. It was the U.N.—i.e., Aryan powers—which were in full control of the Congo. The encirclement of Patrice Lumumba was complete.⁷

Aid for the anti-Lumumba forces in arms, men, money and other facilities, was provided by the chief Aryan powers

6. Ibid., p. 41 (Our italics).

7. What could be said about the attitude of those governments which were *vocally* in favor of Lumumba and had also sent forces to the Congo under U.N. command (e.g., Mali, Guinea, Morocco and the U.A.R.)? Nothing could better explain their negative attitude than the rather subservient letter Nkrumah sent to the then U.N. American representative, Adlai Stevenson, after Lumumba's murder:

"I am sure you know that although I have consistently backed Lumumba politically, *my military contingent serving under United Nations has throughout adopted a completely neutral attitude, obeying implicitly the United Nations Command in Leopoldville*. I think *I can say the same for the contingents drawn from Morocco and Mali*. Nor have I had any information that leads me to believe that the United Arab Republic and Guinean contingents as a whole acted in any way favourably to the Lumumba Government, although I would concede that the actions of certain individuals were suspect (sic)." (Nkrumah's *Challenge of the Congo*, Ibid., p. 150, our italics).

through intermediaries. Britain—which already had its direct agent working in the Congo in the person of Major-General Alexander and the British officers with him—acted through South Africa and “Rhodesia,” as well as through its U.N. Irish contingent; France acted through the lackey priest, Fulbert Youlou of Congo-Brazzaville; Spain and Portugal through Angola; Italy and West Germany through their commercial firms installed in the Congo; Belgium, directly from its military bases of Kamina and Kitona and through Kalondji and Tshombe. The United Nations’ forces—with its Scandinavian High Military Command and Scandinavian U.N. Secretary-General—were the direct expression of American imperialist intervention. All Aryan nations were, in one way or another, involved in the encirclement of Lumumba.

On the international level, a vicious struggle was going on between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. Both of these Aryan powers had a keen eye on the uranium and cobalt of the Congo, not to mention its other minerals. The Congo thus became the first subject of dispute between the two major Aryan imperialisms over a *new* partition of the world into zones of influence.

Caught in the cross fire of the most vicious and cynical of international Aryan intrigues; trapped between Aryan capitalist powers on the one hand, and the powers of the Communist bloc on the other; unable to find the kind of aid he desperately needed from a weak and divided Black world; surrounded by men whose political firmness was far beneath that demanded by the gravity of the situation; faced with ceaseless plots of decrepit bootlickers and hirelings of white domination, Lumumba stood alone, a marked man, cheered and loved by a huge mass of disorganized, disarmed, divided and helpless Black people.

The stage was set for the final act. It came on September 14, 1960 when Joseph Mobutu, *with the full support of the U.N. forces*, staged his “*coup d’état*.” Lumumba had been Prime Minister of the Congo for *less than three months* when he was placed under house arrest by Mobutu and his goons. Having no intention of sitting in his home to await the day and hour of his execution, Lumumba managed to escape on November 27th. He made a resolute dash for Kisangani (ex Stanleyville), where he intended to set up a Provisional Revolutionary Government and wage an armed struggle to achieve real power. In three months Lumumba had drawn all of the logical conclusions and learned all of the necessary lessons. To Lumumba it was now clearer than ever before that an independence which had been taken away by Aryan wars of aggression, could only be regained by Black wars of liberation. The route to Kisangani was the trail to *Revolution!*

But Lumumba was never to reach Kisangani. Mobutu’s henchmen, with the tactical aid of Aryan powers, caught up with Lumumba and his fellow escapees on the first of December. Lumumba now had to face the fate decided upon by the so-called Great (Aryan) Powers. Patrice Lumumba’s martyrdom had begun.

Unmercifully beaten and kicked, subjected to the atrocious torture and humiliation reserved for men and women of the Black race, not once did Patrice Lumumba ask for mercy. Awaiting his imminent death in the prison of Camp Hardy, Lumumba wrote his last letter. Addressed to his wife, Pauline, this letter was to become his political testament:

“... All through my struggle for the independence of my country, I have never doubted for a single instant the final triumph of the sacred cause to which my companions and I have devoted all our lives. . . .

... Dead or alive, free or in prison ... it is not I myself who count. It is the Congo, it is our poor people for whom independence has been transformed into a cage. ... I know and feel in my heart that sooner or later my people will rid themselves of all their enemies, both internal and external, and that they will rise as one man to say No to the degradation and shame of colonialism, and regain their dignity in the clear light of the sun.

... (W)ithout dignity there is no liberty, without justice there is no dignity, and without independence there are no free men.

Neither brutality, nor cruelty nor torture will ever bring me to ask for mercy, for I prefer to die with my head unbowed, my faith unshakeable and with profound trust in the destiny of my country, rather than live under subjection and disregarding sacred principles. History will one day have its say, but it will not be the history that is taught in Brussels, Paris, Washington or in the United Nations. ... Africa will write her own history, and ... it will be a glorious and dignified history."⁸

On January 17, 1961, after enduring a month and a half of indescribable tortures, Patrice Lumumba, the hero, was slaughtered. With him were massacred his loyal companions, Joseph Okito and Maurice M'Pollo.

8. *Congo My Country*, op.cit., pp. xxiii-xxiv.

CHAPTER 3

THE ESSENCE OF LUMUMBISM

Why was Lumumba the only leader of the African continent to have met the fate he did? Why wasn't the "independence" of the Congo as "orderly" as that of all other Black colonies in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and South America which have been granted an "independent" status to date? Why was the "independence" of the Congo saluted with bayonets, invasions and massive disorder, whereas that of all other Black colonies in the world was greeted with the sympathetic accolades of the Aryan imperialist powers?

The above questions can have only one answer. *Lumumba was the only national-separatist leader to have emerged at the head of a Black nation since the days of Jean-Jacques Dessalines and Henry Christophe of Haiti.* The Congo wasn't independent on June 30, 1960. *It was Lumumba who was independent.*

The philosophers of capitulation and adepts to ideologies alien to the Black world, constantly refer to Lumumba as a man dominated by "naivety." They say he went "too

fast," was "reckless," "irresponsible," and that he lacked "political tact." In short, he is accused of not having played games with the Aryan powers of oppression. Lumumba's greatness is that he refused from the very start to deceive his people and become part of that gang of "dignified," "respectable" and "responsible" Heads of State to whom "independence" was granted. Through Lumumba's actions, more than those of any other leader, Blacks throughout the world—particularly in Africa—were made to understand the whole farce known as "independence."

As was the case with Garvey, Patrice Lumumba was unable to accomplish the high task he had set before himself: *the establishment in the Congo of a Black economic, political, cultural, industrial, scientific and military bastion for the liberation of Africa and the rest of the Black world.* It was to this end that he *mobilized* the national-separatist aspirations of the Black masses in the Congo. It was towards the accomplishment of this goal that he sacrificed himself. Lumumba neither failed his people, his nation, his race, nor did he fail his mission.

Lumumba had the type of *country* which Garvey had so desperately lacked. The Congo was—and is!—the ideal strategic zone where, in a relatively short time, a Black revolutionary bastion could be erected. Lumumba was a Black internationalist. Lumumba had the people. Lumumba was a national-separatist who lacked a *national-separatist* army, movement and class to back his program. His *program* was national-separatist in nature, character and content. But again, for reasons beyond his reach, Patrice Lumumba was unable to rely on an *ideology* predicated along national-separatist lines. His grandeur was to have shown us what a Black man—even when alone—can do, once he is free from the stifling, crippling and binding shackles of assimilationism.

Part Three

MALCOLM X

CHAPTER 1

MALCOLM X AND ISLAM

IS IT TRUE, AS SOME SAY, THAT THERE ARE three Malcolm X's: i.e., Malcolm *before* the Nation of Islam, Malcolm *in* the Nation of Islam, and Malcolm *after* the Nation of Islam? No. There were only two. The first was a racially unconscious Malcolm X dominated by integrationist-assimilationism. The second was a racially conscious Malcolm X, the exponent of national-separatism.

The birth of a racially conscious Malcolm X came about while he was in prison from 1946 to 1952. The decisive factor that would forever lead Malcolm X away from integrationism to national-separatism, was directly linked to the teachings of a national-separatist movement, presently spread throughout the United States. As implied by its name, the Nation of Islam is an organization of a religious character, founded and headed by the Honorable Elijah Muhammad. Malcolm X was to become an active spokesman and organizer for this all-Black religious movement immediately following his release from prison in 1952. His rupture with the

Nation of Islam in March 1964, came after more than ten years of militancy within its ranks.

The dispute which led to this rupture was a dispute between national-separatists. It was not a dispute between a Malcolm X who was either "reverting" to right-wing integrationism or on his way to a marxist "conversion," and a Nation of Islam which had become "reactionary." Malcolm X's dissension with the Nation of Islam was twofold. First, he was no longer satisfied with the limitations imposed by the Nation of Islam in terms of *non-religious political action*. Secondly, he was dissatisfied with the *absence of an ideology* within the Nation of Islam—a void filled by religious rites, observance and ordinances.

On the first point, Malcolm's contention that the Nation of Islam was progressively isolating itself from the growing *political* militancy of 30 million Blacks in the United States was, as time proved, 100% correct. Malcolm X was also 100% correct in appreciating the fact that religion is no substitute for *ideology*. And this is the actual key to a comprehension of Malcolm X—the emphasis he placed on *ideology*.

The fact remains that Malcolm X must have departed from the Nation of Islam with a heavy heart. We have yet to see in the United States a national-separatist organization or movement other than the Nation of Islam, which places greater emphasis on economic self-determination as an indispensable prerequisite of the Black man's emancipation. When Malcolm X left this national-separatist body, he left an organization the likes of which was nowhere to be found.

Malcolm X's departure from the ranks of the Nation of Islam did not mean he was leaving the ranks of national-separatism. It was a step forward in search of a *national-separatist ideology*. It was in pursuit of this goal that Mal-

colm X did what he did, said what he said, contacted the people he contacted, read the books he read, and traveled to the countries he did after his break with the Nation of Islam. Malcolm X, whether fully conscious of it or not, was in search of the very element, the absence of which has greatly influenced the setbacks, defeats and political weaknesses of the Black world for many a century. He was in search of an ideology, a *national-separatist ideology*!

In the pursuit of this ideology, Malcolm X was ready to examine anything and scrutinize everything. His travels throughout the Middle East, Africa and Europe (the first trip abroad dating from April 1964) were undertaken with this in mind. Malcolm X held conversations with many official and non-official people. He discussed with several Heads of State. He visited a number of nations in Africa, from those headed by Black stooges like Tubman of Liberia and Kenyatta of Kenya, to those headed by the marxist-oriented Sékou Touré of Guinea and Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana. He also visited various countries in the Middle East, headed by such Arab satraps as King Faisal of Saudi Arabia. And he visited Arab-dominated North Africa, populated chiefly by Blacks who consider themselves Arabs.

In his travels abroad, Malcolm X was confronted with a great many paradoxes of a political, economic and ideological nature. Is it possible that during his trips outside of the United States, Malcolm X was misled by the fictitious picture of "colorless" Islamic "brotherhood," waved constantly before his eyes by white Arabs who obtain thousands of Black slaves from Africa every year? Is it possible that Malcolm X was impressed by the marxian verbiage of so-called anti-imperialist "leaders" whose ideology is composed of two doses of "positive neutralism" and five doses of sheer, unscrupulous opportunism? Is it possible that Malcolm's

assurance in the type of world outlook he possessed was somewhat shaken by the carnival of smiling, "friendly" white faces that greeted him on his swift travels throughout the Middle East, Europe and Africa? Is it possible that once abroad, Malcolm X was unable to recognize those characteristics of Black oppression which did not necessarily resemble those he had learned to recognize by experience in the context of the *United States of America*?

All of this is possible. Malcolm X was neither a prophet nor a god. Like all of us, he was subject to errors, mistakes and wrong appreciations of situations that he was not acquainted with. Malcolm X was not, and could not have been, above mistakes. Neither could he have been in possession of all the facts concerning the various situations he confronted without a prior detailed study of these.

It is indeed possible that, in face of Mecca, Malcolm X mistook the momentary, euphoric fervor unchained by religious belief, for a *permanent* state of amity among peoples of all colors. The scenes of "brotherhood" in Mecca have impressed many a Black person before and after Malcolm X. So have the scenes in Vatican City for that matter, where hundreds of thousands of Black, white and yellow Christians—apparently unmindful of race—are seen together, submerged in a common religious euphoria. Even at the wailing wall of Israel, faithfuls of all colors gather, proclaiming their momentary "*class-less*," "*color-less*" and "*nation-less*" belief in *one* God.

In face of Mecca, Malcolm X wouldn't have been the first Black person who has allowed his own personal religious convictions to overshadow his global political, racial, economic and social preoccupations. Yet, when one knows about Malcolm X's great personal integrity and unquestionable loyalty towards the race he passionately loved, one

could conceive of such a thing happening only against a background of a total lack of information concerning the position—both past and present—of Black populations in predominantly Arab, or Arab-dominated countries.

Unfortunately, as so many of us today, Malcolm X was not informed about the monstrous plight of millions of Black men, women and children, subjected to the most degrading forms of oppression in the various Arab-dominated portions of the Middle East and North Africa. Had Malcolm X inquired from his host, King Faisal of Arabia, about the estimated *half-a-million slaves* held in his kingdom, he would have undoubtedly seen another facet of the "colorless brotherhood" in Mecca.

Since most of us continue to be ignorant of the real facts concerning the status of Blacks in the so-called Arab world, the following newspaper excerpts will serve to detail some of the cruder aspects of their plight:

"When Prince Faisal of Arabia (who is now a King) came to power in November 1962, his government *estimated* the number of slaves in that country to be 250,000 (sic!). . . .

Throughout the last ten years, the annual number of pilgrims entering Saudi Arabia to visit Mecca has exceeded by 10-20,000 the number of those who leave. Many, of course, come with the intention of staying. Others die while there, or else escape the notice of *officials*. *Nevertheless, 10,000 is still a number unaccounted for.*"¹

* * *

"A limited discussion on the suppression of slavery was called to an end on Tuesday by the ECOSOC (Eco-

1. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, April 7, 1968 (Our translation and italics).

nomic and Social Council of the United Nations). . . .

The debates were limited in scope because of the absence of documents in any but the English language and also due to the fact that, of the 114 countries to which a questionnaire . . . was addressed, only 51 saw fit to answer. . . .

The two countries which were the subject of the gravest accusations—Saudi Arabia and Yemen—neither replied to the inquiry, nor did they take part in the debates. Mr. Awad charged that the slaves bought and sold at the so-called 'Dakkat al Abeed,' or slave market of Mecca, are often subjected to torture. He also described how the regular traffic from Africa to Arabia is carried on.

Under the pretext of taking them on the pilgrimage to Mecca, certain individuals recruit domestics from West Africa with the promise of a safe return to their country and of being well cared for while away. The latter are generally taken *across the Sahara* through Niger, Chad and Sudan. Having arrived at some distant point along the coast, they are made to cross the Red Sea in small boats and are then taken to Hedjaz where they are sold as slaves. . . .

At the brief debate on Thursday it was also pointed out that the United Nations should be more informed on this matter. *The fact is, that certain governments refuse not only to recognize the existence of slavery in their country, but also to provide information requested as to the type of efforts they are undertaking to suppress it. Moreover, it would be foolhardy to take for granted the accuracy of the reports provided by governments, let alone depend exclusively on these.*"²

2. *Le Monde*, June 24, 1965 (Our translation and italics).

* * *

"NEW STEPS TOWARDS THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN ALGERIA

A certain number of slaves have recently been freed in Tamanrasset, reports one of our correspondents. As is to be expected, this was not an easy task. Several slaves were put to death. . . . One old slave, at the risk of his life, was courageous enough to stand up. Expelled from the Hoggar region, he made his way to Algiers, where he obtained satisfaction and was ordered back to Tamanrasset. . . .

More than a year ago, a slave revolt broke out and raged from Tamanrasset to Tinduf, but was quickly stifled by the masters. . . . More jittery than in previous years, the slave masters are responding with violence. It is a fact that several slaves have been killed . . .

In 1963, Jacques Pucheu revealed the existence of two thousand slaves in this region (Tamanrasset) alone."³

Malcolm X possessed none of this information. An absolute lack of information, coupled to religious fervor, could

3. *Liberté*, July 1, 1965, France (Our translation and italics).

For further information concerning the existence of slavery in Arab-dominated North Africa and the Middle East, and of the huge mass of West African slaves taken each year to Middle Eastern countries, see: Robin Maugham, *The Slaves of Timbuktu*, Longmans, Green & Co., Inc., New York, 1961; "La Question de l'Esclavage" (published by the *Action pour l'Abolition de l'Esclavage*, 14 rue de Crussol, Paris 11, France); publications of the *Anti-Slavery Society*, Denison House, 296 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London S. W. 1, England; "Esclaves et Negriers 1967" and "l'Esclavage n'est pas mort," *Lectures Pour Tous*, France, July 1963 and September 1971. Also see: *Slavery—Report of the Special Rapporteur on Slavery appointed under Council Resolution 960 (XXXVI)*, No. E/4056, 27 May 1965, United Nations Economic and Social Council (39th Session; Item 29 of the provisional agenda).

very well have acted to obscure Malcolm X's *personal assessment* of what he observed in Mecca. In view of this, Malcolm X (who was generally *on his guard* vis-à-vis all whites in the U.S.A.) could have offhandedly mistaken the *personal* attention paid him by white Arab *Muslim* monarchs, Heads of State and diplomats for an expression of "colorless brotherhood." There is a lesson to be drawn from this. Chiefly, that our *personal religious convictions* (or absence of them) *should play no role whatsoever in determining the political orientation* of a struggle such as ours, which is purely political, socio-economic and racial.⁴

4. Those who go around criticizing Christianity as a "white man's religion," should remember that Islam is *also* a "white man's religion" and that Judaism is *equally* a "white man's religion." They should also remember that Blacks have no other religion which can truly be called *their own*, except for a "religion" of common suffering and oppression at the hands of the same master, and a common historical fate.

CHAPTER 2

MALCOLM X AND AFRICA

Malcolm X's trips to Africa and the Middle East undoubtedly gave him a great deal of knowledge about certain prevailing conditions in these different areas, but they certainly did *not* provide him with any of the elements he was looking for. The only national-separatist leader who had appeared on the African continent—Patrice Lumumba—had been disposed of three years before Malcolm X's arrival.

The Black leaders Malcolm X encountered in his travels abroad were men who had never broken out of the shackles of assimilationism—men such as Nkrumah and Sékou Touré, who had accepted marxism as a means of filling their own ideological void. These were the same men who were unable to come to Lumumba's aid ideologically or otherwise. It is clear that they could be of no help to a national-separatist like Malcolm X who was, precisely, in search of a *national-separatist ideology*.

Malcolm X's contact with pro-marxist African "leaders," such as Nkrumah, was undoubtedly instrumental in bringing about the type of uncertainty he manifested on certain

vital questions during and after his trips abroad. The most important of these being. (a) the relationship between the Black man's worldwide struggle for emancipation and the marxist "anti-imperialist" struggle of *whites* in such places as the Arab Middle East, Arab-dominated North Africa, and Central and South America (so-called *Latin America*) and, (b) the very character of the Black man's struggle itself. This last item can be resumed in the question: Is the struggle of the Black man a *racial* struggle or a *class* struggle?

Both Nkrumah and the marxian colony he harbored in Ghana tried impressing upon Malcolm X that it was "incorrect" to place the struggle of Black people on a racial level. Malcolm was told that the struggle was *not* racial, but a "*class* struggle." And to further drive home the "incorrectness" of his *racially-oriented* outlook, Malcolm was constantly being shown those "friendly" whites who were "helping to build socialism" in Ghana. This was supposedly conclusive "proof" that Aryans could be "devoted" to the Black man's struggle for emancipation.

As most of us have believed until recently, Malcolm X also believed that Nkrumah's Ghana—with its large, corrupt bureaucracy of sycophants, embezzlers and political clowns—was really an *independent* Black state, devoted to the task of African and worldwide Black emancipation. This belief was a highly determining factor in the shaping of more than one opinion he expressed upon his return to the United States.

As Malcolm X traveled throughout Africa, he found whites in key positions everywhere—in states whose governments had proclaimed themselves "revolutionary" and "anti-imperialist," as in those whose submission to Aryan domination went unmasked. In Ghana, for example, Malcolm X was able to see that the French version of *The Spark*, the

theoretical organ of Nkrumah's Convention People's Party, was under the influence of a French marxist neophyte. He also saw that other similar white non-entities—whose insidious racism was masked by a strange "devotion" to Nkrumah—held important posts of various kinds. Some were even the trusted political advisors to President Nkrumah himself. Nkrumah's fascination with white advisors is now notorious. But at the time of Malcolm's visit to Ghana, he could have known none of this. Nor could he have known the story of British Major Alexander, another of Nkrumah's advisors, in relation to the events in the Congo which led to the slaughter of Patrice Lumumba.¹

The power wielded by the colony of "friendly" Ayans imported by Nkrumah into Ghana, is best illustrated by a highly significant incident that occurred after Malcolm X's first trip to Ghana in May 1964. The incident we are referring to involved one, H. M. Basner, a *white* South African marxist who was Nkrumah's top-notch political advisor. No sooner had Malcolm X left Ghana for other African countries than a long article (written by the South African, Basner) was to appear in the official, government-controlled

1. Heading the list of the colony of white Nkrumists who held sway during the epoch of the Osagyefo, were three interesting characters, two of whom were Germans and the other a South African Aryan. The German woman, Hanna Reitsch, head of Nkrumah's Glider's School, attached to the insignificant Ghana Air Force, had occupied the same post in Germany during the Third Reich. The German doctor, Horst Schumann, for whom the West German Government had issued a warrant for "war crimes" during the Hitler period, was President Nkrumah's personal physician. After Nkrumah was toppled, this character was extradited to West Germany where he seems to have been imprisoned for his alleged participation in the elimination of "inferior" peoples. The third, and perhaps the more colorful of all, was the white South African, H. M. Basner, who during Nkrumah's period was one of the most influential people in Ghana, serving as the President's top-notch advisor for political and ideological matters.

newspaper, *The Ghanaian Times* (May 19, 1964), viciously attacking Malcolm X both personally and politically. Malcolm X was accused of "ignorance" concerning the "economic motivations and the class function of all racial oppression." Until Malcolm X admits these factors, argued Mr. Basner quite arrogantly, "*his politics can only be of service to the American imperialists. . .*" Making an insidious comparison between Malcolm X and the fascist, George Wallace (Governor of Alabama), Basner went on to say that "nothing suits the capitalists more than that Governor Wallace and Malcolm X should be at each other's throats because one is white and the other black. . . ." ²

This was not all. A week after Basner's article had appeared—touching off a real storm of indignation from Ghana's students and members of the Afro-American community residing in Ghana—Mr. Basner was at it again. Using Nkrumah, Nelson Mandela and Jomo Kenyatta as examples of "Africans who have slept in white men's prisons, who have felt the lash of white supremacy over their continent and over their people; and who, in those very prisons, reached an understanding that it is the lust for profit and *not racial differences* which makes the white man behave in colonial Africa as he does," Basner urged Malcolm X to follow their example of collaboration with the "revolutionary" Aryans. ³

The Black American scholar, Leslie Alexander Lacy, who was residing in Ghana at that time, gives us a glimpse of the reaction to Basner's attack against Malcolm X.

2. See: Leslie Alexander Lacy, "African Responses to Malcolm X," *Black Fire*, Edited by Leroi Jones and Larry Neal, William Morrow & Co., New York, 1968, pp. 32-38 (Our italics).

3. Ibid. (Our italics)

"The appearance of Basner's article stirred up a lot of controversy and caught the Afro-American community by surprise. Although we knew how Basner felt privately about Malcolm's views, Basner's views had appeared in a black, revolutionary, government-controlled newspaper. And they didn't like it. No criticism, however objective, could have appeared attacking Nkrumah—so why should one appear attacking their political leader? Equally outraged about the appearance of the article were the university students, who already hated Basner . . . and now had another reason to want him out of what they considered a confused political culture.

The day the article appeared, I was having lunch with a friend of mine in Accra. Another Afro-American whom we both knew came over to the table where we were sitting. . . . Finally, he said, 'Leslie, this political situation in this country is too much. . . . Now, dig it—when the brother leaves, a white man is allowed to correct his position in a government newspaper. What do you think about that?'" ⁴

That an incident of this nature could occur, shows the type of situation which was prevailing in Ghana under Nkrumah. It shows how much power was wielded by Nkrumah's top Aryan advisors—such as the Afrikaaner, Basner, and cohorts. To talk of a "counter-revolution," in the form of the C.I.A. promoted *coup d'état*, as having toppled Nkrumah.

4. Ibid., p. 34. For another account of this incident, see also Leslie Alexander's article, "Malcolm X in Ghana," *Malcolm X The Man and His Times*, Edited by John Henrik Clarke, MacMillan Co., New York, 1969.

mah, is pure rhetorical nonsense. There had never been a *revolution* in Ghana in the first place.⁵

5. Ironically enough, the same Nkrumah who tried to inculcate "racelessness" into Malcolm X, was to write (quite unconvincingly!) from Guinea, his present country of exile: "In the modern world, the race struggle *has become part* of the class struggle. In other words, wherever there is a race *problem* (sic) it has become linked with the class struggle." (Kwame Nkrumah, *Class Struggle in Africa*, PANAFA Books, Ltd., London, 1970, p. 27, (Our italics).

By this time, however, Malcolm X—who had been teaching us all the while that our exploitation and oppression had both a class and a *predominantly* racial character—had already been dead and buried for five years!!!

CHAPTER 3

MALCOLM X AND "THIRD-WORLDISM"

What imprint did all of his contacts with the world outside of the United States have on Malcolm X's political appreciation of reality as he had seen it prior to his experiences in Middle Eastern countries, Europe and Africa?

From certain *opinions* expressed by Malcolm X during and after his trips abroad, it is apparent that his own *personal* assessment of certain issues did not correspond to the actual reality. As remarked earlier, this was partially due to either a lack of information or misinformation about certain situations. The fact that Malcolm X was a fervent *Muslim*, may have also favorably prepared the terrain for his brief encounters with Semitic whites whose "revolutionary" revindications went hand in hand with a proclamation of *Islamic* faith. It is not difficult to transform a religious bias into a *political* one.

However, an *unconscious* religious bias is not enough to explain certain *opinions* which Malcolm X expressed after his trips abroad. There is no doubt that his Ghana experience

and his exposure to a constant barrage of marxist propaganda—challenging over and over again his national-separatist outlook—are factors which must also be taken into account. The result of all this is that Malcolm X became somewhat unsure about the relationship between the Black man's struggle and that of *white* left-wing "anti-imperialist" movements both in Arab lands and in South America. This is reflected in the following statement he made in January 1965, concerning his encounter and discussions with a white Arab diplomat:

"(W)hen I was in Africa in May, in Ghana, I was speaking with the Algerian ambassador who is extremely militant and is a revolutionary in the true sense of the word (and has his credentials as such for having carried on a successful revolution against oppression in his country). When I told him that my political, social and economic philosophy was black nationalism, he asked me very frankly, well, where did that leave him? Because he was white . . . he was Algerian, and to all appearances he was a white man. And he said if I define my objective as the victory of black nationalism, where does that leave him? . . . So he showed me where I was alienating people who were true revolutionaries. . . .

So, I had to do a lot of thinking and reappraising of my definition of black nationalism."¹

Yet we ask: How could an Arab reproach Malcolm X for describing himself as a "Black nationalist" when this Arab's very "credentials as a revolutionary" were established under the banner of "*Arab* nationalism" and the fight for "*Pan-Arabism*" Aren't terms such as "Arab nationalism,"

1. *Malcolm X Speaks*, Merit Publishers, New York, 1965, p. 228.

"Arab world" and "Pan-Arabism," also exclusive? Or was Malcolm X also expected to proclaim himself an Arab?

Malcolm X's conversation with this white Arab "revolutionary" diplomat would have certainly taken another direction had the latter been questioned about the socio-economic status of Algeria's sizeable Black population—of which an estimated 3-5000 are still held as slaves in the southern region of that country. What ways and means did this "revolutionary" *Pan-Arabist* and his "socialist" government envision towards the immediate and total suppression of the enslavement of Blacks? What measures were being taken by his government towards the prompt eradication of the fierce racism rampant in fellow Arab nations, including his own? These questions would have undoubtedly revealed a great deal more about this white Arab "revolutionary" than met the eye!

The ambivalent reaction of Malcolm X to a *white* Arab "revolutionary" is characteristic of a great many of our own reactions today vis-à-vis the "anti-imperialist" struggle of whites in the Middle East, as well as those in Central and South America and the Caribbean (so-called Latin Americans). This ambivalence is a reaction to a concept which has become known as the "Third World."

In essence, the concept of a "Third World" is based on the affirmation that *all* the inhabitants of the underdeveloped areas of the world are linked by an "objective solidarity" which cuts across all national, cultural, class and color lines. The said "solidarity" is determined by a common feature of socio-economic underdevelopment and exploitation by the same industrial powers. The Martinican, Frantz Fanon—whose active political life was devoted to fighting for the independence of the Arabs of Algeria—was chiefly responsible for the formulation of this concept. Is "Third-World-

ism" a *scientific* concept? Is it a valid concept? Is it a concept that will advance and enlighten our struggle, or will it retard and sidetrack the universal struggle of the Black man?

The first observation to be made concerning the concept of "Third World" solidarity, is that the very basis of this "solidarity" is neither stable nor permanent. For instance, if country "A" in Africa is linked by a bond of "solidarity" with country "B" in South America because both are underdeveloped and exploited by the same industrial powers, what becomes of this "objective solidarity" when country "B" becomes industrialized and country "A" remains in the same underdeveloped status? For example, take Japan, Argentina, Australia, the Soviet Union and Chile, just to mention a few. Fifty years ago, all of these countries would have been classed as underdeveloped. In the space of one generation, these same countries have emerged into industrial societies. In the case of Japan and the Soviet Union, we face two of the greatest industrial powers in the world today. Both are presently committed to the exploitation of the underdeveloped countries to which they were once linked by an "objective solidarity" based on underdevelopment.

Another example is the case of Israel. Here is a country which, in the space of 25 years, has gone from the status of a conglomerate of raggedy Jewish fugitives to the position of the most industrialized and technologically-developed state in the Middle East. The Israelis, considered an "oppressed" people, linked by an "objective solidarity" with all other oppressed peoples, are just as committed to the plunder of the Blacks of Africa as any other Aryan power. Is Israel (solidly allied with South Africa and the Aryan fascist gang in "Rhodesia," and whose entire economy is based on the exporting of polished diamonds it obtains fraudulently from Africa) a member of the "Third World?" If not, are Jews

as such, who fancy themselves as being an "oppressed people," part of the "Third World?"

And how about the Arab whites? Will they continue being part of the "Third World" once they achieve within another decade the industrial and technological level of Israel, Australia, South Africa, Argentina and Canada? Will these highly developed *white* Arab nations be in a situation of "objective solidarity" with the huge mass of Black Africans who, for some strange reason will remain as always holding the bag of hunger, misery, underdevelopment and illiteracy? "Third World" solidarity is thus at best a *shifty* "objective solidarity"—a solidarity whereby the "ally" of today becomes the fierce enemy and exploiter of tomorrow! Such is the basis of a solidarity which ignores the complex and decisive influence of class, cultural and racial factors in the historical development of societies.

The affirmation inherent to the "Third World" concept, that the "objective solidarity" linking the inhabitants of underdeveloped areas cuts across all lines—whether cultural, national, racial or social—needs to be analyzed in detail. How does one explain the situation of *racially heterogeneous* countries within the framework of a Third Worldist "colorless" and "classless" solidarity?

For example, a country like Brazil is classed among the underdeveloped nations. Brazil, as it now stands, is, therefore, a part of the "Third World." Blacks (76%) and whites (7%) inhabit Brazil—the former being the descendents of *slaves*, and the latter the descendants of the slave *masters*. In Brazil, it is the white minority which rules; that is, from a *class, racial, cultural and historical* standpoint, it is the whites who are the dominant and exploitative element. Is there an "objective solidarity" *inside* of racist Brazil between the white ruling class and the exploited, oppressed mass of

Blacks? Who represents the "Third World" in countries such as Brazil? When the "Third World" meets, the Black representatives of a nation like Tanzania are liable to find themselves shaking hands with the white supremacist representatives of a country like Brazil.

Another example is South Africa which is classed among the highest industrialized nations. South Africa is, therefore, *not* a part of the "Third World." Are the exploited and impoverished Black masses of South Africa part of the "Third World" or not? Their country is considered an industrial country; in fact, South Africa is quickly becoming a leading technological and industrial power. Are the masses of *white South African workers* a part of the "Third World" or of the "industrial World?" Who represents the "Third World" in South Africa? Are the *white* workers of South Africa—viciously white supremacist and fascist—linked by a common bond of "objective solidarity" with the Aryan rulers of that country or with the oppressed, crushed Black masses of South African workers?

There are too many strange paradoxes involved in this "Third World" business for us not to see that it is neither a scientific, nor a politically valid concept. "Third Worldism" stands as the direct successor of "non-alignment" and "positive neutralism." Yesterday we were sold the idea of a "Non-aligned bloc"—a group of underdeveloped "anti-imperialist" nations linked by an "objective solidarity" based on a refusal to accept either communism or capitalism. "Non-alignment," we were told, was also a concept which cut across all national, cultural, class and racial lines. "Non-alignment" committed suicide. Now to replace it, is "Third Worldism."

In reality, "Third Worldism" is but *an attempt to transfer integrationism from a national to an international level.*

Advocacy of "Third Worldism"—with its emphasis on a "colorless" and "classless" objective solidarity—is nothing but the advocacy of integrationism. The concept of a "Third World" is an integrationist myth. It is a Leftist myth. As such, it is not surprising to find the Mecca of the "Third World" located in marxist Cuba. Nor is it surprising that "Third Worldism" has now become "Tri-Continentalism." Behind Cuban-based "Tri-Continentalism" we are faced with none other than Soviet imperialism.

"Third Worldism" (or "Tri-Continentalism") is thus nothing more than a marxist-integrationist hoax, supported and promoted by Soviet imperialism, with the intent of putting the brakes on a *racial realignment of forces, particularly on the part of the Black peoples of the world.* The chief victims of this hoax are Blacks—a race exploited and oppressed by *Latin* whites in South America, by *Semitic* whites (Arabs and Jews) in the Middle East and North Africa, by *Nordic* (Anglo-Saxon) whites in South Africa, Australia, Europe and the U.S.A., and by *Slavic* whites right in the Soviet Union.

"Third Worldism" (alias "Tri-Continentalism") is, consequently, no aid whatsoever to the universal struggle of Black peoples for racial and socio-economic emancipation. Rather, it is one of the greatest single challenges to it that has developed since the days of slavery and colonization. It is a hoax, a myth *aimed at the universal racial demobilization* of the Black World—the first step towards a marxist "final solution" to the "black problem."

Under the influence of the myth of "Third Worldism" (or "Tri-Continentalism"), a Black man could be kept from seeing many things. For instance, he could be kept from seeing the "revolutionary" and "anti-imperialist" struggle of the Arabs of the Middle East and North Africa for what it

actually is: i.e., a struggle to reconstitute, in a modern setting, the Arab Empire of the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th centuries. If this is not so, then why do the Arabs of North Africa scornfully reject being called "Africans," preferring to link themselves *racially, culturally, politically*, and otherwise with Arabs in faraway Iraq, Syria and Lebanon? Why the insistence of black-skinned *pseudo-Arabs* in Mauritania, the Sudan, Egypt, Eritrea and Somalia to designate themselves as "Arabs" and as part of the "Arab world" when, in fact, they are as black as any Black man in America, and as part of Africa geographically, as is Ghana, Tanzania or Guinea???

Under the influence of "Third Worldism," "Tri-Continentalism," or any other such "ism" bent on erasing Black racial solidarity from the picture, a Black man could also be kept from seeing the "anti-imperialist" struggle of white Latins in Central and South America and the Caribbean, for what it really is: i.e., an attempt on the part of a *white left-wing* (or marxist) *middle-class* to unseat from power and replace old-time white bureaucratic oligarchies with its own brand of white supremacist power (e.g., Cuba).

What about the Black masses in Central and South America and the Caribbean who form the overwhelming numerical majority in *most of the countries of this area*? Are the *Latin* "revolutionaires" going to struggle for the enthronement of their own racial and class interests, only to relinquish the power obtained to the majority population of Blacks? If so, then why aren't the *Blacks* in power in Cuba? They form more than 75% of that country's population. Yet it is the Aryan minority in Cuba—with Castro at its head—which rules that country. Furthermore, why are all of the *Latin* "revolutionary" and anti-imperialist" movements of Central and South America and the Caribbean,

composed and directed exclusively by the sons and daughters of Spain and Portugal?

White "revolutionaries" of South America are no more disposed to relinquish the *right to rule* which they, as whites, have inherited from their slave-trading and colonialist forefathers, than are the "revolutionary" rulers of the Soviet Union disposed to relinquish to China those portions of her territory seized by the Czarist Empire. It would be naive to think that the Marxist and "anti-imperialist" struggle of the *white* South American middle class is aimed at anything else than the enthronement of its own *class, racial* and *cultural* interests.

There is no reason to doubt what the nature of Malcolm X's assessment would have been concerning the anti-imperialist" struggle of Latin and Arab whites, had he been provided with all of the foregoing elements. Wasn't it Malcolm X who underlined the identity of the Bolshevik, French and American revolutions as *white nationalist*? We do not feel that Malcolm X's *personal* religious convictions could have kept him from seeing the "anti-imperialist" nationalism of *Arabs* of the Middle East and *Latins* of South America for what it really is: white nationalism!²

2. The present-day breed of *white, middle-class, marxist* "anti-imperialists" (in what is erroneously designated as *Latin America*) has its historical antecedents in the 19th century when the "anti-colonialist" struggle against Spain and Portugal was launched under the leadership of *white* aristocratic classes (slave-owners, intellectuals, big land-holders and merchants). With the massive utilization of Black slaves as cannonfodder, white chieftains, such as O'Higgins (Chile), San Martin (Argentina), de Céspedes (Cuba), Miranda and Bolívar (Venezuela), initiated the wars of "independence" from the "mother country." Once independence had been won with Black blood, the Black masses were immediately put back in their places. *The enslavement of Blacks was maintained in all countries after the proclamation of white independence.* Indians and Blacks were massacred in Chile and

Argentina to "whiten" the newly-independent republics. Bolivar had to quell an insurrection of Blacks in Venezuela who refused to accept the betrayal. The head of the insurrection, Carlos Piar, one of Bolivar's Black generals, was executed along with unknown numbers of his followers!

Another example of this phenomenon of revolutionary white supremacy is also found in the "anti-colonialist," white "revolutionary" struggle headed by George Washington—who proclaimed the United States independent from Britain, but who maintained the enslavement of the Blacks *after* independence. Ian Smith of "Rhodesia" simply came on the scene *too late* to be a "revolutionary" and "anti-colonialist" hero! When the Castro-Guevarists of South America present themselves as "continuator" of the work of Cespedes and Bolivar . . . they're not lying!

CHAPTER 4

MALCOLM X AND THE BLACK AMERICAN STRUGGLE

There is no doubt that the program of the O.A.A.U. (Organization of Afro-American Unity) and Malcolm X's teachings in general, have been instrumental in bringing about the wide-ranging changes that have begun to shape the national destiny of 30 million Blacks in America. The development of the national-separatist struggle of Black students all over the United States; the upsurge of national-separatist trends in the domains of culture, politics and economic organization; the increasing awareness and identification of North American Blacks with their brethren in Africa, Asia, Oceania, Europe, Central and South America and the Caribbean; the trend now observable in the United States against Aryan aesthetic and cultural values, towards "something of our own"—these and countless other less perceptible, but significant transformations, bear the distinguishable imprint of Malcolm X's teachings and the program of the O.A.A.U.

Throughout the twelve years that Malcolm X spent within the Nation of Islam, he voiced the chief theme of the Honorable Elijah Muhammad's program: the obtention of "land somewhere" for the building of an independent Black nation. Reference to "one" or "several states" in the U.S.A. where this could be achieved, was common in Malcolm X's speeches during this period. After his departure from the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X was less insistent (at least, publicly) on this particular question. Is this to be interpreted as an abdication of the objective of ultimate total independence for the 30 million Blacks in the United States?

Malcolm X was indeed faced with a dilemma. To abandon the objective of Blacks constituting themselves into an *independent Black nation* would inevitably signify the acceptance of some sort of arrangement of "peaceful coexistence" between Blacks and whites in the U.S.A. Such an "arrangement" would mean that the whites, by virtue of their majority status, would *continue* to maintain their dominant economic, political, cultural and military supremacy, while the Blacks would continue to be citizens of a nation whose very existence is a daily proclamation of Black oppression.

A variant of this solution would be the adoption of the old left-wing cry of "revolution." For Malcolm X, this would have meant adopting the slogan, "Black and White Unite and Fight," so dear to the trotskyists. This in turn would have signified the adoption of the principle of "alliance" with the treacherous Aryan left-wing groups. It would also have meant accepting the concept that Black "emancipation" is directly linked and subordinated to the "revolutionary awakening" of the greedy, fat, ultra-fascist, white American proletarian swamp.

Hence, the dilemma facing Malcolm X was twofold. To accept the "freedom *now* under capitalism" solution—mean-

ing, at best, a call for full *American citizenship* of the 30 million Blacks in the United States—signified an abdication of national-separatism in favor of right-wing integrationism. To accept the marxist "freedom *tomorrow* under communism" solution, meant a relinquishment of national-separatism in favor of left-wing integrationism. Both "solutions" had been advocated many times before and always with the same results of implacable deadlock.

The problem facing Malcolm X was the same problem Marcus Garvey had confronted in the 1920-1930's. Garvey's national-separatist program gave no *national tasks* to the Blacks either in the United States or elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, except that of *supporting* the U.N.I.A.'s program of building a Black bastion on the African continent. Garvey's total preoccupation with that part of his grandiose plan allowed him to sidestep the one vital question: What should the mass of people who supported him do for themselves *in their respective nations* while the Black bastion was being built??? Garvey's failure to face this problem was the source of a great weakness, a weakness which facilitated the dismantling of the U.N.I.A. everywhere. The U.N.I.A. was implanted in many countries, but in none of them did it apportion to its followers a *national task* consistent with their day-to-day *national*, political, economic, cultural and social preoccupations and realities.

After leaving the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X's "silence" concerning the building of a *separate, independent Black nation* in North America was NOT a sign that he had abdicated this national-separatist goal. His thinking on the question seems to have been more complex. The fact that he made no explicit statement in this direction—added to the more significant fact that after him no one has dealt with

this aspect of the issue—shows the real complexity of the question.

In more brutal terms, the dilemma facing Malcolm X after his break with the Nation of Islam (and which Garvey's U.N.I.A. sidestepped), can be resumed as follows: What should American Blacks struggle for? Integration into Aryan America, either by becoming inferior "capitalists" without capital or political power, or by advocating a communist "revolution" which, if ever successful, would make them its first victims? Or should the Blacks of the United States struggle for the realization of an independent and separate Black nation in North America? Malcolm X opted fully for the latter solution while, *at the same time*, advocating a relentless struggle for the obtention by Blacks of the *human* rights due to them as citizens of the U.S.A.

Malcolm X's position, then, was one which advocated a struggle for the fulfillment of the Black man's *human* rights in the United States *with national independence in mind as the ultimate outcome*. In other words: "Let's struggle to build an independent nation right where we are by initiating a struggle towards the fulfillment of our immediate and most basic needs and the progressive establishment of our own separate institutions in every field." Malcolm X's objective, his goal, the very essence of his O.A.A.U.'s unmistakably national-separatist program, was to achieve *national-racial-autonomy* as a first step in a long and complicated process of struggle which would eventually culminate into independent Black nationhood.

The dynamic approach developed by Malcolm X to the difficult and very complex struggle of Blacks in the United States filled a great vacuum. The fact is that post-slavery national-separatists in the U.S.A. had never concentrated on *political action*. Booker T. Washington's national-separatist

program omitted any emphasis on political and social activity; it subordinated everything to the goal of economic self-sufficiency and technological advancement. Garvey's U.N.-I.A. in America was involved in no political action of significance. The same holds true for Elijah Muhammad's Nation of Islam, and this was one of the reasons why Malcolm X was dissatisfied with its program.

Malcolm X was the first national-separatist in the United States to realize that the absence of a *political dimension* to post-slavery national-separatist thought in America had created a vacuum which has been filled by the reactionary, integrationist, boot-licking stratum of American Blacks. Malcolm X pinpointed one very great source of weakness in American post-slavery national-separatist movements: the exclusive preoccupation with the angle of economic self-sufficiency to the detriment of any national *political* activity. This attitude, he accurately realized, had left the way clear for the development of integrationist-assimilationist organizations. He summed up this idea as follows:

"I say this, that if the law of the land states that you and I have the right to do thus and so, it doesn't take a picket to establish that right. All we've got to do is go and do it. . . .

And you actually do the whole thing a disservice by not getting involved, because what you do is create a vacuum, into which steps Uncle Tom. And Uncle Tom takes all the black belts and leads them the non-violent way. No, I say let's all get in it, and get in it without compromise. . . . If black people in Alabama are trying to register and vote, if they're trying to register, then those black people in Alabama are within their rights. Anyone who in any way interferes with them is breaking the law. Well, our people in Alabama, our people

in Harlem, our people in California are the same people. You and I will not get anywhere by standing on the sidelines, saying they're doing it wrong. I spent twelve years doing this in the Black Muslim movement, condemning everybody walking, and at no time were we permitted to get involved to show a better way. Okay, I say let's get involved. But let's get involved all the way. Let's don't get involved in a compromise way."³

Malcolm X saw that a program of economic self-sufficiency—the very basis of independent Black nationhood—had to be coupled with a *political* program, addressing itself to the political-social deprivations imposed on the Black man and woman. He saw the need to end that situation whereby none but integrationist organizations agitated for those political and social rights denied to Blacks. He realized that as long as such a situation continued, Black people would be misled, over and over again, in the direction of integrationist-assimilationism. He saw that no program designed exclusively along lines of economic self-determination could sustain, over a long period of time, the interest, support and attention of the Black masses *who suffer not only from economic exploitation and privation, but from every sort of social indignity and political deprivation*. Malcolm X saw that Black people needed urgent social and political solutions to *immediate* and very serious problems (i.e., filthy, deteriorated, rat-infested housing; inferior-standard schools with Aryan-oriented curricula; police brutality and harassment; the absence of jobs; low salaries; absence of health facilities, etc.).

Malcolm X's insistence on linking an ultimate goal of independent nationhood with agitation of a social and polit-

3. *Malcolm X on Afro-American History*, Merit Publishers, New York, 1967, p. 45.

ical character did indeed fill a great and dangerous vacuum in the development of post-slavery American national-separatism. How can one turn his back on social and political agitation for those rights which the mass of Black people *pay heavy taxes for, but have never enjoyed*? How can one preach total obeisance to the laws of a nation (including that law which drafts a man and sends him abroad to die "for his country"), and then relinquish the fight to acquire those rights and prerogatives naturally associated with the compliance to these laws?

"Let us set out on the road to ultimate independent Black nationhood—right here where we are—by initiating a *generalized* struggle towards the fulfillment of our immediate and most basic needs, the establishment of our own separate institutions in every field, and the acquisition—by any means necessary!—of the social and political rights and prerogatives overdue us"; this was the essence of Malcolm X's long-range and short-range program, his ultimate goal and immediate preoccupation.

It is this very richness of Malcolm X's political thinking, his sharp hindsight and foresight, that has confused those whose political thinking has never defied the complexity of devising a correct national-separatist strategy, either short-term or long-term, in the gigantic, rich technological, industrial and arch-reactionary United States of America, with its 162 million white supremacists.

Consistent with Malcolm X's overall goal, the military dimension of his thinking emphasized violence, *not* as an end in itself, but as a means towards the accomplishment of one of the most basic needs of Blacks: protection against wanton murder, brutality and harassment.

Malcolm X's first step in the direction of adding a political and social dimension to American national-separatist

thinking was to launch the slogan, "Human Rights," and reject the old, integrationist-oriented war cry of "Civil Rights." The difference that Malcolm X made between *human* rights and *civil* rights was not a play on words. Nor was he launching a "humanitarian" slogan. When he said that "Civil rights is domestic. Human rights is international,"⁴ he was clearly rejecting the term "civil rights" because of its exclusively *domestic* orientation. Malcolm X did more than emphasize the *international* character of the Black man's struggle in the United States. By *human* rights, Malcolm X meant any and all rights by which *Black* men and women can realize a dignified, happy and *free* existence; an existence *free* from hunger, privation, racial oppression (overt or covert), economic exploitation, cultural strangulation and terror. In Malcolm X's thinking "human rights" and ultimate *independent Black nationhood* were one and the same thing. Lumumba said it: "(W)ithout independence, there are no free men!"

Within this perspective of ultimate independent Black nationhood, the indispensable unification of Blacks in the Western Hemisphere (i.e., North, Central and South America and the Caribbean) became one of Malcolm X's most important goals. Within this same perspective, he also saw the strategic importance of concretely linking the inter-Black alliance in the Western Hemisphere with the struggle of Blacks in Africa, Europe, Asia and Oceania. *Malcolm X envisioned the struggle for independent Black nationhood in the U.S.A. in co-relation with the struggle of Blacks everywhere else.* Hence, he realized that a solidly structured *Universal Pan-Black Organization*—of the type Garvey had created—was an absolute must sooner or later.

4. Malcolm X, *By Any Means Necessary*, Pathfinder Press, Inc., New York, 1970, p. 20.

Malcolm X thought in terms of concrete, strategic *pan-Black alliances*, both on a continental scale and on a world scale. Malcolm X was a *Black internationalist*. He understood the role which Blacks as a race had played in history. His lucid political appreciation of the *international* character of Aryan domination and of the balance of forces with which Black Americans had to contend made him even more of a Black internationalist.

Didn't Malcolm X, time and time again, stress the international character of the Black man's struggle, oppression and destiny? Didn't he try to impress this very point upon Blacks wherever he went? Wasn't this the main theme of his address to the gathering of African Heads of State which convened in Cairo in 1964? Listen to him as he politely drives home this point of a single struggle, a single oppression and a single fate of Blacks all over the world, in a memorandum submitted to the meeting of the O.A.U. (read: *Organization of African Uncle-toms*):

"Some African leaders at this conference have implied that they have enough problems here on the mother continent without adding the Afro-American problem.

With all due respect to your esteemed positions, I must remind all of you that the good shepherd will leave ninety-nine sheep, who are safe at home, to go to the aid of the one who is lost and has fallen into the clutches of the imperialist wolf.

We, in America, are your long-lost brothers and sisters, and I am here only to remind you that our problems are your problems. . . .

Our problem is your problem. No matter how much independence Africans get here on the mother contin-

ent, unless you wear your national dress at all times, when you visit America, you may be mistaken for one of us and suffer the same psychological humiliation and physical mutilation that is an everyday occurrence in our lives.

Your problems will never be fully solved until and unless we are also recognized and treated as human beings.

Our problem is your problem. It is not a Negro problem, nor an American problem. This is a world problem. . . "5

To whom was Malcolm X addressing this clear, far-sighted plea? To an assembly composed mostly of traitors and hirelings of Aryan domination. Malcolm X was addressing this plea to many of the same treacherous "leaders" who had turned a deaf ear to Lumumba's repeated pleas for help less than five years before, and who had been more than happy to see Patrice Lumumba crushed to bits by the ferocious Aryan conspiracy. More than one of these "Heads of State" had had a direct hand in facilitating the Aryan conspiracy against one of the most dedicated sons to have emerged from the womb of the Black World. It was to this assembly of bare-faced plantation overseers of Aryan domination, that Malcolm X addressed this beautiful call for international pan-Black solidarity and unity!

Malcolm X's *Black-oriented* internationalism was a lot more than a heart-felt expression of his full comprehension of the lessons of history. In addition, it was political common sense. How else, but in coordination and tight solidarity with the struggle of Blacks throughout the world, could one view the struggle of 30 million Blacks entrenched

5. *Malcolm X Speaks*, op. cit., pp. 73, 74-75.

in the very entrails of one of the two mightiest Aryan powers to rule the world today?

Malcolm X saw that there was an organic link between a concrete continental and worldwide alignment of Black forces, and the fulfillment of the goal of independent nationhood for 30 million Black Americans. An alliance of Black forces *within* the United States was the first step towards this goal. He set out to achieve this with the creation of the ill-fated O.A.A.U.

To Malcolm X, the independent alignment of Black forces *within* the U.S.A., coupled to an alignment of Black forces on both a continental and worldwide scale, was the *only* Black national-separatist perspective possible. Any other perspective than this would lead to capitulation to the old, worn-out, left-wing *integrationist* temptation of "alliance" with a decrepit, white supremacist Left. The idea of an "alliance" with Left-wing white supremacy is a stillborn infant which Black marxist fanatics resuscitate each time they muster enough force to rear their heads in the Black community disguised as "black patriots." Nothing indicated that Malcolm X ever fell for this worn, torn and shorn marxist cliché.

CHAPTER 5

MALCOLM X IN PERSPECTIVE

Many national-separatists feel a certain embarrassment when confronted with some of the statements made by Malcolm X during and after his trips to the Middle East and Africa. Many of these statements have been avidly seized upon by the white Left to "prove" its thesis that Malcolm X had "abandoned," or was "on the verge of abandoning" the path of national-separatism, to join the limping ranks of one or another variant of the marxist caravan. The Black adherents of marxism-leninism use these statements of Malcolm X as a shield, behind which they go about implementing their program of left-wing assimilation and "revolutionary integration."

Aided by the embarrassed silence of Malcolm X's intimate companions and by the silence of Black national-separatists in general, both white and Black marxists have had a field day in portraying Malcolm X as a "repentant" convert of the marxian religion. They have propagated the image of a "transformed" Malcolm X, prostrated at the feet of St. Marx, St. Lenin, St. Castro and St. Trotsky—worship-

ing at an alien shrine and participating in this international "revolutionary" fraternity of falsehood. Less than a decade after his death, integrationists to the Left and Right of white supremacy alike, have summoned Malcolm X to their ranks of treason.

Was Malcolm X an integrationist-turned-national-separatist who reverted *again* to integrationism either in its right-wing or left-wing expressions? Did Malcolm X make an about-face so as to embrace those whom he had designated all along as the universal *enemy* of Black mankind? Did Malcolm X abandon the defense of his oppressed race by relinquishing the dignified, proud, conscious national-separatist stand he had acquired through so much intellectual and personal effort? *Nothing* which Malcolm X did or said, either prior to, or after his departure from the Nation of Islam, can justify the belief that he was about to turn his back on his suffering people, relinquish his revolutionary mission and join the ranks of the enemy.¹

Once having embarked on the path of national-separatism, Malcolm X never abandoned it. The political, cultural, social and economic evolution of his thinking was set against a national-separatist background. In 1964, he left the Nation of Islam in search of a national-separatist ideology. After his trips abroad, Malcolm X returned to America equipped with a thousand and one newly acquired, disparate, political, and socio-economic facts. He aimed at sorting, coordinating and structuring these facts into a coherent

1. The most vigorous and lucid refutation of the fallacy that Malcolm X was reverting to a stance of either right-wing or left-wing integrationism, has been provided by his close brother and friend, the Reverend Albert Cleage. Unfortunately, we are unable to reproduce his long and highly interesting statement here. We strongly urge a reading of his: "Myths About Malcolm X" in: *Malcolm X The Man and His Times*, op.cit., pp. 13-26.

framework of thought and action. A great many of these facts were incorporated into the program of his O.A.A.U. The O.A.A.U., its program and its goal were intrinsically national-separatist in content, form and expression.

Malcolm X was a national-separatist. National-separatism was not Malcolm X, any more than it was Marcus Garvey or Patrice Lumumba. Whatever mistakes Garvey, Lumumba or Malcolm X made in their appreciation of a given situation, they are not enough to invalidate the *political orientation* of their existence as conscious Black men, dedicated to one and the same goal. It is their contribution towards bringing us ever so much closer to the goal of Desalines and Christophe, their dedication to this goal, that we must consider. If there is confusion surrounding Malcolm X, it is because certain Blacks have tried to substitute Malcolm X for a political orientation, for an ideology yet to appear.

Malcolm X was a national-separatist in search of a national-separatist *ideology*. He was the first national-separatist leader to be so acutely aware of the fact that the absence of an ideological framework of thought and action—patterned after the needs of Black people and consistent with the historical experiences of the Black race—was largely responsible for the failures and setbacks of every single national-separatist effort undertaken since the Haitian Revolution of 1804.

In his search for a national-separatist ideology, Malcolm X put his finger on the one chief determining factor, besides actual experience, on which an ideology is based: *the scientific scrutiny of history*. This he summed up as follows:

"(I)t is impossible to understand the present or prepare for the future unless we have some knowledge of the past. . . .

When you deal with the past, you're dealing with history, you're dealing actually with the origin of a thing. *When you know the origin, you know the cause.* If you don't know the origin, you don't know the cause. And if you don't know the cause, you don't know the reason. . . . So the past deals with history or the origin of everything. . . . And when you know the origin, then you get a better understanding of the causes that produce whatever originated there and its reason for originating and its reason for being."²

Like Patrice Lumumba, Malcolm X suffered from the lack of both a national-separatist *class* and a national-separatist *movement* similar to the one possessed by Marcus Garvey. Malcolm X lacked, as did Garvey and Lumumba, a national-separatist *ideology*. Like Lumumba and Garvey, Malcolm X had a national-separatist *program* (worked out only 8 months prior to his death). Like Lumumba and Garvey, Malcolm X had the people. It was facing his people that he accepted his fate.

On a cold afternoon, on February 21, 1965, as he had barely begun to address his people, the long arm of the enemy swiftly struck him down, with the treachery and brutality characteristic to our history as an oppressed and suffering race. Thirty million Blacks in America lost their personal hero; the Black firmament gained another star, pointing as brightly as the others, to the only direction of universal Black emancipation.

2. *Malcolm X on Afro-American History*, op. cit., pp. 3, 4.

CONCLUSION

BLACK PEOPLE HAVE FALLEN PREY TO every slanderous lie on every issue put out on the market by our universal enemy and his hirelings. Why? Because to begin with, there is no structured framework of revolutionary thought cut to suit the particular historical experience of the Black man the world over. Where are Black theoreticians who link theory to practice, whose theory is Black-oriented and drawn exclusively from the Black historical experience? They are practically non-existent. For a race in excess of one billion in numbers, spread out to the four corners of the globe, so diverse culturally, ethnically and linguistically, yet so alike in its experience of racist oppression and degradation, this is a grave situation.

The absence of our own revolutionary ideology is the dilemma confronting the Black world. It is not the ingredients for such an ideology which are lacking. Ideologies are not inventions, nor are they the product of "geniuses" or so-called exceptional minds. In essence, an ideology is a set of principles drawn from the historical experience of a given people, a people submitted to the same general social, eco-

conomic and cultural realities, in a common historical situation. An ideology can also have revolutionary or reactionary aims; it can be for oppression or for liberation from oppression. If it is revolutionary, the aim of this set of principles is to explain to this given people *the causes* of their past situation and their present situation, and *the ways and means* to bring about a future situation consistent with their desire of an independent and free existence. Ideological principles come about through research. Once they have emerged through research and are correctly put together in a coherent whole, they serve for action. Briefly, then, an ideology is a set of principles drawn from the historical experience of a particular people and, as such, it provides the guidelines for action, for change, in the direction desired by that people.

In view of the above definition, the dilemma facing the Black world today is directly linked to another void: the almost total absence of revolutionary, Black-oriented researchers, dedicated towards extricating from our history those principles which, gathered in a coherent whole, can act as the only sure guide to Black revolutionary action.

When we talk about the absence of Black-oriented researchers, we do not mean the absence of a pseudo-Black clique of individuals who parade as intellectuals. This we have. In small numbers, but we have it. And this is precisely what we can do without. By and large, the Black intellectual who has existed for centuries in the Black world, is an assimilationist. The fact that he is essentially a copyist, already shows to what extent he is mediocre. Devoid of all sense of initiative, lacking the quality of independent thought, he actually takes pride when white men, like Sartre, Daniel Guerin, or, a George Breitman, prefaces the works of Lumumba or Malcolm X. His interest in Garvey, if any, will be limited to a reading of *Black Moses* by the white man,

Edmund Cronon, rather than Garvey's own *Philosophy and Opinions*.

This assimilationist Black intellectual—who is both Black and intellectual only in name—is only too glad when Malcolm X, Lumumba and Garvey are used to further marxist propaganda. In fact, to him a Black man has no merit unless he figures alongside some white supremacist like Marx, Guevara, Lenin, Trotsky or Castro. It's the white seal of approval which counts for him, not the thinking of a Black individual. All of this explains why the assimilationist Black intellectual is either a crude marxist pamphleteer, mouthing slogans of the international communist movement and seeking "revolutionary integration," or a sophisticated, degree-hunting academician, parrotting the crassest pro-capitalist, petty bourgeois, assimilationist rubbish. In either case—whether he is a right-wing or a left-wing assimilationist—he is always a pamphleteer, never a researcher.

For these reasons, the Black layman, the ordinary Black man and woman, must begin taking matters into their own hands. If we wait on the integration-seeking intellectuals to become researchers and engage in the far-ranging historical, political and economic appraisals which stand at the base of an ideology, we are doomed. Black men and women of all walks of life must make a concerted effort to break the deadlock. For this, we need to break through the barrier of intellectual intimidation. We must begin voicing our opinions, arriving at our own conclusions, instead of waiting on the next fellow to do our thinking for us.¹

1. The above implies that we are in dire need of independent outlets of expression to gather and publish those works from all over the Black world which will be instrumental in bringing about an ideological framework of thought englobing the experience of every single Black community and society. The wide-ranging diversity of the Black world makes this an imperative. We have

Independent opinions and conclusions can only be the product of research, conducted in all fields, in every aspect of our past and present history, and embracing every single segment of the Black race wherever it may be. The emergence of a Black revolutionary framework of thought and action, the product of our collective and very particular historical experience, can only come about from a collective effort undertaken not by self-seeking assimilationist-minded intellectuals, but by the ordinary Black man and woman of today.

We have our example in Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm X. Initially, none of them had more than a formal schooling. These were self-taught Black men who read and studied *on their own*. They arrived at the conclusions they did from their own research, from their own analyses of the Black reality, not from what they learned from some Aryan-oriented university or college professor. Had they pursued a university degree as such, there probably wouldn't even have been a Garvey, Lumumba or a Malcolm X as we know them.

These were men who set a high premium on learning any and everything that would help to change the plight of the Black race. They demystified the cult of book-ism and in-

already seen the consequences of not being able to depend on independent Black publishing companies, printing presses, newspapers and other mediums of expression. Besides, it just doesn't seem right that a conscious Black person should be forced to go through a publishing house, newspaper or revue, controlled by our oppressor whether of the Right or of the Left. Those who want to stigmatize our call for an independent Black press as "Black Capitalism," can call it that if they like. Yet, how can one not see that it is these same characters who rush with their manuscripts to leading Aryan *capitalist* publishing firms, such as Doubleday, Ramparts, Maspero, Gallimard, MacMillan and Co.?! This is just another example of the shameless duplicity of certain right-wing and left-wing intellectuals.

tellectual scholasticism. By their example, they brought us to see the value of learning, studying, criticizing and analyzing *on our own*, the value of independent Black theoretical research and analysis. What is bookish about discovering why the Black world is in its present state? What is scholastic about finding the source of the Black man's misery?

With the means at their disposal, they tried to get at the roots of *our* reality. They sought answers and solutions which correspond to *our own* historical experience. It was into this particular experience which they delved, not into that of the white Arabs of the Middle East, the white Jews of Eastern Europe, the white Europeans of Western Europe, or the experience of Aryans anywhere else.

Garvey, Malcolm X and Lumumba were our first modern theoreticians. But they were not theoreticians engaged solely in research. Another common feature that bound them together was the fact that *they were men of action*. They did research *because* they were men of action. Conversely, their action constantly led them into more and more research. In these three men, we have a clear example of the type of revolutionary theoretician which the Black world is calling for: men and women of action, who are engaged in research; men and women whose research is geared towards more intensified action. In essence, they showed us what a Black theoretician ought to be.

When we point to the fact that these three men were exclusively occupied with the historical experience of the race they sought to emancipate, we are pointing to an important fact. Today many seem to believe that a theoretician is *per se* someone who has either gobbled up, in whole or in part, the writings of Marx and Engels, Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin, or someone who goes about quoting Fidel Castro, Che Guevara, Jean-Paul Sartre, Marcuse or some other such



Aryan "eminence." Those who believe this are the same ones who believe that there is no relevant ideology possible outside of marxism. They even go to the extent of pretending that marxism is a "universal" ideology, colorless in essence and, in nature, adaptable to "all" peoples. This is certainly a strange "universal" and "colorless" ideology, especially when its conclusions and principles were drawn from analyses confined exclusively to the historical experience of Aryan societies and communities!

Previously, we said that an ideology is a set of principles drawn from the historical experience of a *given* people, a people submitted to the same general social, economic and cultural realities, in a common historical situation. Marxism is no exception to this definition. Marxism-leninism is a set of principles drawn from the historical experience of a given people—Aryan people—a people submitted to the same general socio-economic and cultural realities in a common historical situation—in this case, a situation we know as white supremacy. Marxism, then, is nothing more and nothing less than an Aryan ideology.²

Is it possible that either Garvey, Lumumba or Malcolm X were on the path towards a marxist "conversion"—as some have dared to claim—when their whole approach was to seek their answers and draw their conclusions from the historical experience of a given people (Black people), a

2. Is marxism-leninism a revolutionary ideology, seeking the "liberation of mankind," as some would argue? Or is it an essentially reactionary and white supremacist ideology whose chief aim is to maintain Aryan world hegemony once capitalism is overthrown? The answer to this question can best be found today in the doings of the U.S.S.R. and its marxist satellites. Also of interest, would be an examination of marxism in Cuba, where the overwhelming majority of the population is Black, but whose government is, strangely enough, lily-white. Everything seems to indicate that concerning Cuba, the half has not been told!

people submitted to the same general social, economic and cultural realities in a common historical situation—i.e., a situation of enslavement, colonization, *racist* oppression and subordination to the economic super-exploitation of Aryan oppressors?

Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm X were on their way to bringing about something new. That much is for certain. Whatever research they were able to accomplish under those difficult conditions of struggle which they faced, it was taking them towards something *new*. And, as we know, marxism is not new; it has been here for over a century now.

What Marcus Garvey, Patrice Lumumba and Malcolm X were leading up to through their own research and action combined, was to the formulation of an entirely novel set of principles drawn from the historical experience of the *given people* they fought and died for—Black people. That's why we say they were our first modern revolutionary theoreticians. Had they been aiming at a marxist "conversion," they would have been delving into the historical experience of the people whose social, economic and cultural realities provided Marx and Engels with the basis for the marxist ideology. Had these three men been aiming or drifting towards a marxist "conversion," they would have spent their time, like others have done before them and still continue to do after them, memorizing marxist-leninist quotes. Had this been the case, they would most likely be alive today; no Black man or woman has ever been slaughtered for being a marxist. But, then, they wouldn't be the Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm X we know.

* * *

Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm X were three Black men with one burning, intransigent goal: the salvation of

Black people everywhere. They were three men with one aim, one purpose, one vision: the total and complete liberation of the Black world from the stranglehold of white economic, political, military, cultural, psychological and ideological domination and exploitation. Three men who possessed a single aspiration: the coming of a new Black race, a new Black civilization, a new Black destiny.

Pointing to our shame of Blackness, they instilled us with a sense of racial, cultural and historical pride. Showing us up as weaklings and cowards, they imbued us with self-confidence and courage. Shaking us from our complacency, they confronted us with our responsibilities. Exposing our traitors from within and indicting our enemy from without, they enlightened us. Whatever they demanded of us, they demanded of themselves first. They were not seekers after the impossible. The greatness they demanded of us was commensurate with the greatness which they knew we could and should attain: That greatness which, as Lumumba said so beautifully, would make us "show the world what the Black man can do when he works in freedom."

Black people, we are the heirs of a great legacy: the political thought of three of the greatest men to have emerged from the Black womb at any time. Yet, because we seem to have the shortest memory of any people in the world, we have let our legacy lie fallow. We have too quickly forgotten the lessons taught us by Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm. And one of the main things they taught us was that without a historical vision we, as a people, are doomed. Without a historical perspective, we are bound to fail. It's like trying to build a house on sand, on a foundation that will eventually crumble.

A strong vision and identity with our past is the only sound basis for constructing an independent future. *Only*

when we can first identify and then eliminate the causes for our historical downfall, can we be in a position to plot a course that will result in the reconquest of our worldwide freedom. As long as we are unable to first identify and then correct the basic economic, political, cultural and social weaknesses responsible for our crushing historical defeat, we shall remain the spectators of, and participants in, our own oppression.

Garvey marked the opening of the 20th century with one of the greatest revolutionary movements that the Black world has known. He pointed the way to the Black man's liberation. Yet, we let him go down not *in* history but *outside* of it, as if his life had been peripheral to our very existence. It took two decades after his death for Lumumba and Malcolm to rise in his footsteps and once again point us in the direction we should take. Now that they are gone, how long will it be before we decide to strike out on our own, united into one strong, determined body? How long will it be before we realize that it's not the greatness of any one Black man or woman that will make our race great, but the concerted efforts of the *entire* Black race?

We must follow the example of Garvey, Lumumba and Malcolm X and assume our responsibility as they assumed theirs. It's not any inherent qualities that make a Black national-separatist, but a man and a woman who hold the interest of the race above everything else. Black national-separatists are neither "divine," nor are they "flawless" individuals. They are simply determined Black men and women who are not afraid of waging a lifetime of conscious, self-scrutinizing criticism so as to uproot their integrationist origins. Men and women who, by their own self-efforts, will confront and overcome the stumbling blocks put in their path. Men and women who will neither flinch in face of the

enemy, nor compromise the destiny of their race through alliances with the historical oppressor.

The salvation of the Black race, the revolutionary resurgence of the Black world will not result from turns to the Left or to the Right of Aryan supremacy. Our march, if it is to be a glorious march to victory, must be in a *new direction*.

Black man, Black woman, turn not to the Right, forsake the Left.

Come now,

Let us march together

in a new direction;

FORWARD!